THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Very Rev. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., The Deanery, Exeter, to whom MSS. should be sent. Reviews and all business communications should be addressed to S.P.C.K., Northumberland Avenue, London, W.C. 2.

Vol. XXXIII DECEMBER, 1936 No. 198

EDITORIAL

At the end of a year it is natural to take count of changes. And of changes there are plenty in these days to be observed. The old order has given notice to the landlord and has gone on the march. The country is moving to the town; great buildings in what Dr. Inge has called the American-Babylonian style spring up everywhere; pylons and air-stations are common objects of the countryside. And, though there is reason to believe that at a deep level the national character remains much the same, the conditions of its life are changing. We are more regimented than we used to be. No one supposes that the English people will ever submit to anything like the ruthlessly "conditioned" state of Mr. Huxley's *Brave New World*, or even to the degree of discipline practised in many nations on the Continent. But we have been put to school. It is an old story, but it is coming to pass in a new way. In 1870, when the Cowper-Temple Clause was passed by the House of Commons, Disraeli pointed out that a new sacerdotal class was being set up at a moment's notice, the Elementary School teacher. The religious teaching might be anything, provided it was not the teaching of any known Church or any known religion. So thoroughly did they in the nineteenth century believe in religion, and disbelieve in the Church. But whatever it was, a new form of regimentation came into English life in 1870.

To-day the same tendency operates, with a new terminology, a new technique, and a new priesthood. New "Education Acts," less official, but even more widely influential, control our lives. Large-scale suggestions are made to us all by the B.B.C., the Press, and the Cinema. Sets of ideas are put before us, a certain way of life is commended to us, ideals are pictured before our eyes. Anonymous dictators instruct us what to think, say, do and be. Some of the suggestions are

high-minded, none of them are desperately wicked, but some are sordid, vulgar, money-grubbing. The net result of them all is that we are losing our initiative, our independence. The Chrysostoms of Portland Place, the ingenious leader-writers, the film-producers with their astonishing knowledge of how to be sexy without being indecent, ignoble without being degrading, worldly without being devilish—these point the tale, even if they do not always adorn the moral, of contemporary life. As in 1870, a new sacerdotal class has arisen.

It is no wonder that with all this pressure we are being assimilated to one another. At the beginning of the fourteenth century "Master Roger," working together with "Robt. of Forde" and "Richd. of Streme" on the Quire and Presbytery of Exeter Cathedral, indulged their own fancy not a little; Roger carved the figure of his favourite dog in half a dozen places, and even recorded in the Lady Chapel a little bit of scandalous history, a Canon (not the Dean) putting out his tongue at the Bishop. The modern young man enters a great motor-works, and thinks he is going to learn to assemble cars. He finds that his work is to fasten the same nut in the same place to car after car after car day after day after day. In the evening he frequents the large-scale recreations which are available, and receives the suggestions about life which are in circulation there. The tendency is all in the direction of uniformity.

And yet we have that in us which resists the pressure. Dr. Gilbert Murray in his *Ordeal of the Present Generation* suggests that the charge of illogicality commonly brought against the English people is not quite fair. The logic of the Latin nations pursues one end remorselessly. The Englishman sees several ends and tries to pursue them all. The result is less in the way of immediate and spectacular efficiency, and sometimes an unfortunate immobility in the early stages. But there is still among us what Sydney Smith claimed to have, "a passionate love of common sense and common justice." Anything of Sydney Smith's is, of course, stamped with the mark of the old, nineteenth-century, rather complacent Whiggery, which was often misled by surface considerations, and has been disturbed by the Apocalyptic thunderbolts which have descended into the modern world. We are floundering, but the ideals have not lost their visibility. We still believe that out of the material which is available God will provide some better thing.

We are often said to trust in "muddling through." It is not quite a fair description. Such confidence as we have

depends on belief in the divinity that shapes our ends, and on belief in certain human capacities, some of them rather deep down, not elicited at first, going stiffly into action, but with a good deal of staying power, rather like what runners call the second wind. A visiting preacher in a certain parish on Low Sunday, 1916, had been asked to combine the topics of Easter, St. George (it was St. George's Day), and Shakespeare. He did this to the best of his ability, and in the course of his sermon he said that, if things then were like things now, our Patron Saint very likely went into the conflict imperfectly equipped, with no anti-gas apparatus to resist the dragon's breath, and perhaps other handicaps. There had probably been some muddling, but "muddling through" was a very incomplete description of a victory which demanded strong qualities if it were to be achieved at all. The sermon in question was well received by some, but not by all. One lady said indignantly to the Vicar, "Who is that dreadful man? He compared Mr. Asquith to St. George and the Dragon." The preacher had not done that, because St. George and the Dragon were, to begin with, on different sides, but he had used the story, with his fanciful embellishment of it, as a ground for expressing confidence in the soundness of the national character.

In other walks of life the same thing is seen. The German Professor—or perhaps rather the German *Privat-Docent* who has hopes of becoming a Professor—lets loose upon the world a brilliant conjecture, supported by an ingenious selection of evidence. Another *Privat-Docent* replies with a no less ingenious and no less extravagant counter-conjecture. The battle rages. Pamphlets go into second and third editions, and the learned world is electrified. Meantime English scholarship is quietly going on. The English scholars learn from the German experimentalists much that they had not known before, but they are not carried away. In the end they strike a balance, and, with the help of the Germans, often prove more right than the Germans were themselves. It is again no bad illustration of the usefulness of slow solidity. Our belief in democracy is built on the conviction that there is good human material available, and that out of it God will build some better thing than has been. We could not describe our ideal community, as a secular dictator could. But that is a tribute to the ideal. No one can describe the Kingdom of God.

A recent visit to Ireland has enlarged the Editor's regard for the Irish Church. They are not a very numerous body, and in

the South they are losing members through emigration. They are held tight by their Canons and Constitution, and there are ceremonial customs which have become familiar and almost non-controversial among ourselves which in the Church of Ireland are expressly forbidden. But they know what they believe much better than the rank and file of English Churchmen, and their communicant statistics put ours to shame. Their clergy are in the same sort of position as that of the early Tractarians. Not many of them are actually Tractarian, but, like the Tractarians, they are compelled to commend their teaching by its bare truth and by the spiritual force with which they can present it. And very well they do it. The Editor brought back one flower of rhetoric which must be put on record: "The situation is rampant with near-sightedness and insularity." But this was only one purple patch in a speech by a young layman which was full of good sense and knowledge. Politically, it would seem on the whole that the old Die-Hard attitude is beginning to pass, and that a united Ireland is coming nearer. On the other hand, it must be admitted that this observation relates only to the South. In Ulster both character and conditions are very different, and the prospect of unity seems rather remote. Much will depend on Trinity, that ancient and splendid home of the best University tradition, and something also on St. Columba's, which is a Church Public School, the sister foundation to Radley. A steady stream of Irish Churchmen sent into the professions and into public life will cause the Irish Church to play a great part in enriching and unifying the life of that island of tragedy and hope.

We are shy of uttering particular recommendations of S.P.C.K. books, for fear of charges of Autolycising, but this time it is impossible to resist the claim of special excellence. The Rev. J. R. Lumb, Rector of Chislehurst, has edited two little books, *The Children's Pulpit* (3*s.* 6*d.*) and *Aims and Ideals of Christian Living* (paper 2*s.* 6*d.*, cloth 3*s.* 6*d.*), which deserve a very large circulation. The former has an introduction by the Bishop of Bristol, who has given to innumerable overhearers wonderful examples of the use of a new technique in the teaching of religion to the young. The other is commended by the Bishop of Bradford with all his wonted insight and incisiveness. He warns us against "that pernicious readiness for casual talk and argument about religion which is so often allowed to pass current as 'religious interest.' Let us remember that an 'open forum' is historically a place in which many people meet only for gossip." *Aims and Ideals* contains material

for forty-eight Bible classes, by eleven writers, including Dr. Sydney Nicholson and two accomplished women teachers, and both the choice of subjects and the way in which they are handled are alike admirable. The other book contains thirty-seven Children's Sermons. They deal with profound things simply, and they shew that the day of the Children's Sermon is far from done. Even very experienced priests and teachers will learn much from them. For our own part when we recall our own homilies, which were either too stilted or too familiar, with but one half-pennyworth of education to an intolerable deal of padding, we are cheered to learn that it is really possible to give instruction without being didactic, to be interesting without levity, to be affectionate without sloppiness.

The second volume of *Viscount Halifax* has come into our hands too late for more than a passing notice in this issue. It shall be properly reviewed next month. Suffice it to say that it is good reading. The events described are nearer to our own time than those of the first volume, and they are treated with full knowledge and occasionally a good measure of that calculated indiscretion which was so essential if the real picture of the old paladin was to be painted.

The writer of our article this month on German Faith Movements is a German lady of pure Aryan blood, who has been deprived of her place in the cultural life of Germany in order to make room for a man. For reasons which will readily be understood, she prefers to remain anonymous.

THE PARISH PRIEST AND THE LIFE OF PRAYER

Two Lectures delivered at the Worcester Clergy Convention, Oxford, September, 1936

LECTURE I.—THE PRIEST'S LIFE OF PRAYER

We are to consider today, at the beginning of this Convention, the priest's life of prayer: what it means, what it is for, why it matters so much. It is true, of course, that in thinking of prayer we must guard against the inclination to regard it chiefly as a way of getting strength and help; a making use of God. Nevertheless, in your case, it is the unique source of your effectiveness. Other things—intellectual and social aptitudes, good preaching, practical organizing power and activities—help your work and help much. None of these, however, is essential. Prayer is. The man whose life is coloured by prayer, whose loving communion with God comes first, will always win souls; because he shews them in his own life and person the attractiveness of God, the reality, the demand, the transforming power of the spiritual life. His intellectual powers and the rest will not, comparatively speaking, matter much. The point is that he stands as a witness to that which he proclaims. The most persuasive preacher, the most devoted and untiring social worker, the most up-to-date theologian—unless loving devotion to God exceeds and enfolds these activities—will not win souls. Hence your life of prayer, your communion with God, is not only your primary obligation to the Church; it is also the only condition under which the work of the Christian ministry can be properly done. You are called, as the Book of Wisdom says, to be "friends of God and prophets"; and you will only be good prophets if you are really friends of God. For your business is to lead men out towards Eternity: and how can you, unless it is a country in which you are at home? You are to represent the peace of God in a troubled society; but that is impossible if you have not the habit of resorting to those deeps of your spirit where His quiet presence dwells. We all know this; but it is desperately hard to keep our grasp of it and go on putting it into practical effect. Everything in modern life, and perhaps especially in the life of the parish clergy, tends to make it more difficult. For the first thing that occurs to you is, that your

mandate, after all, is to feed and cherish the sheep of Christ, to give your life for that: and in most cases this is, and in all cases it can be, a full-time job. The demands on your time, interest, kindness, patience, and energy are constant, and must be met; for your model is one who serveth. So the determined setting aside, and holding against all comers as a first charge, of a substantial daily time for communion with God might not in your case be justified if it were only done for the sake of your own soul. But it has a far greater sanction than that; and I think it will clear the real issue if we state it at once in the strongest terms. A priest's life of prayer is, in a peculiar sense, part of the great mystery of the Incarnation. He is meant to be one of the channels by and through which the eternal God, manifested in time, acts within the human world; reaches out, seeks, touches, and transforms human souls. Your real position in your parish is that of the dedicated agent of the Divine Love. The spirit of Christ, indwelling His Church, is to act through you.

It is true that His freedom is absolute, and that He can and does act through all sorts of people in all sorts of ways. But you have specially offered yourselves for this. Can anyone hope to fill such a position as that, unless his relation with God, his confident communion, and perpetual self-offering, is the first and most real thing in his life? He must be a living part of the Praying Church, woven into her eternal act of adoration, if his work among souls is to be done. He has to bring his people into the Presence of God, to offer in their name the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; and these are great and realistic spiritual actions, which demand in those who perform them a vivid spiritual life and constant resort to spiritual food. If you, set apart for this purpose, do not put the supernatural first, no one else is likely to do so. And if in practice this is difficult, and means a tiresome wrench and readjustment of your daily habits, God can never be adequately served or truly known except by the path of sacrifice.

Of course it is true that the direct worship of God does not cover the whole of your vocation. You are ordained to be both deacons and priests: the special character and grace of the diaconate was not obliterated when you received the great privileges of the priesthood. You are still those called to serve the brethren, as well as being those who go up to the altar of God: and it is that double vocation, turned towards the Eternal *and* towards the human—love of God and love of souls—which makes the tension and richness of your life, and must be reflected in your prayer. For you, at any rate, the cultivation of the inner life, the deepening of your spiritual

sensitiveness, can never be a self-regarding task: it is the very condition of your effectiveness.

All this means the maintenance of a right balance between the visible and invisible, active and contemplative sides of your vocation—adherence to God in prayer; and because of that adherence, supported and fed by it, a creative, cherishing, patient, redeeming love and service poured out to men. When we come down from principles to practice, the pressure on your time is often so great that it seems as though this exclusive attention given to God is only to be had at the expense of time and attention which are needed by your people, that solitary communion with God is in the nature of a spiritual self-indulgence, and the detailed response to the demands and needs of your flock is always nearer to the mind of Christ. But surely Christian history steadily contradicts that view. It is always the priest whose life of prayer is deep and strong, and a first charge on his time, whose work for God and souls is also deep and strong. Yours is a supernatural vocation; how can you fulfill it, unless you live a supernatural life? Much is being said now about evangelism; but before we get effective evangelism, we have to get effective evangelists. Evangelism is useless unless it is the work of one devoted to God, willing and glad to suffer all things for God, penetrated by the attractiveness of God. New machinery, adaptations, and adjustments are not the first need of the Church of England, but more devoted, adoring, sacrificial souls. These are supernatural qualities, given by God in our hours of direct attention to Him; and these are the only lasting source of that charity, that invincible loving-kindness which will help us to show the beauty of Christ to others and so win them for God. It is terribly hard for human beings to believe this, believe it enough to carry it out; but those who do carry it out have no doubt of its truth.

Consider the Curé d'Ars, the pattern and patron saint of parish priests. There was a man of very humble origins, of very limited intellectual power, and with the minimum of education needed for his career: but with the maximum of devotedness. From the human point of view, this was his total equipment. At a very difficult moment in the history of the French Church he was sent to a particularly hopeless village, where religion and morals had gone to seed; and there he spent his whole life. No preferment, no external help, either spiritual or material, no apparent scope. Yet bit by bit, as his spiritual power developed and the strange magnetism of a living Christianity was felt, this poor, obscure peasant-priest became the conscience of France, the determining

influence in thousands of lives; his church was a place of pilgrimage for a multitude of troubled souls from every part of the country. There was no reason at all for this except the power of God acting through a soul transformed by prayer. I suppose few could tackle his average working day; the number of hours which he spent in pastoral work and in his church, often sixteen out of the twenty-four, either in worship or in ministering to those who came to him. So long as anyone needed him, he just went on and on. But this intimidating programme, and this untiring love and care for souls, still left time for that which made it possible: the deep personal life of prayer, self-offering, communion, supplication—loving, realistic, confident intercourse with God.

Again, come to an example from our own times and our own Church—the career of Father Wainright of St. Peter's, London Docks. Fifty years in one parish, which was hardly civilized when he came to it, but "washed by the tears of his people," as one of them said, when he died. Fifty years spent, not in ministering to the respectable members of the congregation, but in constant devotion to the lost sheep, the drunkard, the degraded, and the criminal; appearing in the middle of the night unasked at the bedside of the dying, and bringing security and peace.

We can realize the demands of such a career as that; the staying power it requires. How was it done? It was done in the strength drawn from a constant communion with God; supported and expressed by the daily Eucharist, and by the hour of absorbed devotion which followed it, and which no call was allowed to interrupt. I suppose there are few Christians who would not be thankful to accomplish a tithe of what Father Wainright did for Dockland: but the way in which he did it is the only way in which such work can be done. To do great things for souls, you must become the agent and channel of a more than human love: and this must be the chief object of the priest's life of prayer. It means a most careful preservation of our Lord's balance between solitary communion with the Father and loving self-spending among men.

We turn from this to strictly practical considerations. Accepting this fact that your Godward life, your prayer, is your first duty, indeed your first necessity, what are the lines on which it can best be developed? Your time is limited by your various obligations; even though the first charge on that time is your communion with God. Moreover, you share with all other human beings the humiliating fact that your attention to things of the spirit cannot be suddenly produced, or sustained beyond a certain point. Even at best it will fluctuate

a great deal, and often need preparation and support. So you are not only limited from outside by your pastoral duties, but also from within, by the very facts of our human nature. Therefore your devotional life must be planned with prudence as well as fervour. Even that quiet, speechless waiting on God, that trustful self-abandonment to His purposes, which is one of the most deeply refreshing of all prayers, is always apt to fall away into wandering thoughts or mere drowsiness if we presume and try to maintain it too long; or do not feed it wisely by thoughts and by reading, which tend to deepen in us the sense of God's greatness and the spirit of adoring love. So it is well to let the reading and vocal prayer which feed and prepare our times of mental prayer be always about God, and not about men. Dwell most on the mighty, positive qualities of the Eternal; mean God, not His works, as the mystics say. He alone matters, He alone is: frequent in your reading the society of those who know this, and catch something of their spaciousness of mind, their deep realism, their devoted love. Let God flood your life: and then, in His light and power, confront the problems of that life.

Again, there are days for everyone when the forms of our prayer become dead, tasteless, and unreal to us: sometimes, indeed, almost repugnant. The offices are dreary and meaningless, and we can produce nothing of our own, and don't want to produce anything of our own. Our ceiling, as airmen say, is low. No one escapes this experience; and the character of your lives, your constant preoccupation with religion, must keep you specially exposed to it, and make it specially painful in your case. For whatever you feel, or do not feel, you must still try to present religion in its freshness and attraction, even though it seems stale and unattractive to you—deliberately discounting your own misfortunes, and practising the most searching self-oblivion at the very heart of your spiritual life.

All this means that the prayer of the priest must never be allowed to become too individualistic. He needs the constant support which is given by remembrance of his corporate situation, as a member of the one, supra-personal, Praying Church: the constant sense that the prayer of that Church goes on, and we, whatever our feeling or our failings, are an integral part of her life. *She* offers the one sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. We sink our small lives and small spiritual efforts in that great worshipping life, carrying on, as faithful members of that Body, through the periods of spiritual darkness as well as the periods of spiritual light.

There is always a nightshift, and sooner or later we shall find ourselves serving on the nightshift; and if our prayer is

mainly of the individual and subjective sort, giving too much space to feeling and not enough place to will, it puts us in a very poor position, doesn't it? What we all need then—and the priest, I suppose, needs very specially—is some link between our own fluctuating communion with God and the great continuous action of the Church: a devotional pattern, a reminder of the vast life of prayer coming out of the past and stretching forward to the future, into which our prayer is woven; something which shall steady us, transcend our changing feelings, and keep our minds in tune with the mind of the Church. The priest, of course, has this pattern laid down for him; a pattern in which all the deepest spiritual truths of Christianity are gathered up and conserved. The outlines of his life of prayer are already drawn, in the Divine Office, which he must recite morning and evening in union with the whole Church, and in the Eucharist, which it is his sacred privilege to celebrate. And in a general sense we may say that it is by deepening and enlarging the dispositions which these great acts of worship demand and foster that his spiritual life will grow best. If he pours into this mould all that he can of his adoration, his penitence, his love, and so makes it, as he can do, the living instrument of his converse with God, he needs nothing more. He is then part of the great life of the Praying Church; and his personal life of prayer, which so easily becomes lonely, thin and worried, at the mercy of passing moods, if cut off from that of the main body, gains dignity and power: for it is offered in and with Christ, by Whose Spirit the Church lives.

Look first, then, at the Daily Office, as the material, the ordained vehicle of your daily prayer. What is it? Essentially, it is a beautifully balanced act of pure worship. Its material is nearly all Biblical; so that here Evangelical and Catholic are at one. By far the larger part—the Psalms and Canticles—is great religious poetry, charged with inexhaustible meaning, suggesting far more than it says, and capable of lifting up those who use it rightly, and introducing them into the atmosphere of eternity. Surely it is a great thing that twice every day you must withdraw your attention from all the details and demands which beset you, feed your prayer by reading and meditation of the Scriptures, and yield to the influence of this sacred poetry with its dominant mood of adoring and disinterested delight. What a tragedy that this part of a priest's duty, which can lead him out to the supernatural, and is inexhaustible in its spiritual suggestions, should ever become formal, hurried, unreal! See how the Western Church from the earliest times has put the *Venite* at the beginning of the great

office of Matins which opens her daily cycle of prayer, to give the colour and accent of her worship. All her ministers are required to adore God under this formula every day; to come before His presence with thanksgiving, and shew themselves glad in Him with joy. That is the temper in which the Offices should be said. "Leave the transitory, seek the Eternal," says Thomas à Kempis. Twice a day the Divine Office compels you, for your soul's health, to do this. "Lord, open *thou* my lips, and my mouth shall shew forth thy praise!" We begin with the direct appeal to God, as the only cause and author of prayer. The Church of England, in selecting from the Breviary the material for her Morning and Evening Office, seems specially to have desired to emphasize this note of worshipping joy. Every morning, as well as the *Venite* and *Benedictus*, the *Te Deum* or the *Benedicite* are to be said or sung. Those glorious songs, if we mean them, ought to be enough to send Christians off for the day's work in very good spirits, more focussed on God's splendour than on their own difficulties. We all know how hard this temper is to maintain through the tensions and ups and downs of life—anxiety, pressure, disappointment, loneliness, ill-health—but how magnificent it is that every day the Church calls you decisively to return to this note of triumph and joy; to contemplate the loveliness of God. He whom God pleases, pleases God! said St. Augustine. There you have in a nutshell the meaning of adoring prayer. And only the priest whom God really pleases is going to make others really care about God.

So adoration is to stand first in the priest's ordered prayer: and all he says and does is to be coloured by this. In fact, the rhythm and proportion of the Lord's Prayer shall be the rhythm and proportion of his whole life of prayer: first God in Himself and his worship of God and relation to God—Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be Thy Name!—then, and only then, our human situation and needs. God in His Holy Perfection, the Father of all life, already completely present, bathing and penetrating us. The prevenience of God and adoration of God are the dominant facts of the life of prayer, and especially your life of prayer. For such adoration means getting our attitude to Reality right, and keeping it right. It is the essential preparation of all decent action; and especially all religious and pastoral action. The Christian priest is called to be a fellow-worker with God and a yoke-fellow with Christ, both pulling at the same cart: and the object of your life of prayer is to keep you fit for this glorious privilege, weld you ever more and more into the organism—the Church—that is working for the triumph of God. It is to set the scene for your

penitence, your moral striving and your devotedness—for that deep and intimate conversation as of one friend with another, which is the cause and support of the consecrated life; and in which we at last learn to say, without any reserves, and without counting the cost, "Thy Will be done." God, says Paul Claudel, "keeps up a continual conversation with every creature." He has a special conversation to maintain with each of us—and the traditional praise and prayer of the Church, rightly practised, is a wonderful means of tuning us in to it. When the conversation is established, then, and only then, come your petitions: as in the Divine Office they follow the Psalms, Canticles, and Lessons—that is to say, the adoring and meditative parts of prayer. Sometimes, it is true, the conversation will be mainly a confession of faults or a disclosure of weakness or depression; but this, too, can be brought into the tranquil presence of God and have its quality changed by contact with His reality. It is this sequence of praise, attention, and prayer which gradually trains us to a complete suppleness in His hand, a total acquiescence in His mysterious purpose; so that our actions become, more and more, the actions of the Holy Spirit in us. This alone is to be, in a true sense, a minister of the Gospel; that is, an agent of God's self-expression in the world. Unless your will is thus turned to God, unless He is your true centre of interest, your prayers of supplication for light and strength in your work, for your people and their needs, for sinners, will not be truly alive or truly real.

The Daily Offices, then, can and should give a frame for your daily prayer; with its varied movements of adoration, penitence, meditation on the Word of God, and supplications to God. But all this has reality and worth because of something far deeper, involving the very life of your soul; and this deeper life and movement is embodied and expressed in the liturgy of the Eucharist, the central act of Christian worship. The rhythm and movement of the Eucharist shew forth in a wonderful way the true rhythm and movement of your ministerial life; which is, of course, a part of the great rhythm and movement of the Church's life. That is to say, it is first an offering made to God, an oblation, and a consecration to His purpose of that which is offered—your life. And after that a return-movement to men, bringing to them the Food of Eternal Life; and a fellowship in the receiving of that gift. For the Eucharistic mystery is the outward and visible expression of the Eucharistic life, by and for which the Church exists; that is, a natural life given in its wholeness to God, laid on His altar, like its tokens the natural elements of bread and wine, and consecrated, transformed by His inpouring life, to be used

by Him to give life and food to other souls. That is surely the essence of your vocation. You are the Body of Christ, as St. Augustine said to his communicants. You are meant to be offered as a reasonable and living sacrifice, and so made the vehicles of His self-imparting love. With what great and searching force that saying comes to the priest. Whenever the Church celebrates the Eucharist she performs her supreme act of worship, and she also celebrates the mystery of her being; and you are, each one of you, not only a bit of that living Church, but a member specially set apart for this sacred work. That tremendous fact must surely dominate your life of prayer, which must be penetrated by the twin dispositions of total self-offering to God and of total dependence on God. Here, you share the central religious experience of the saints: you come up to the frontiers of the supernatural, stand in that Upper Room whose window opens towards Calvary, commemorate the great movement of charity of which the Church was born, and renew the sacred action in and through which the Divine self-giving is set forth, the soul is nourished, and the Church and her Master meet. Your own private prayer can hardly fail to be deeply coloured by this great religious act; or, as it grows in depth and breadth, to be more and more harmonized to the rhythm of the Eucharistic life, as the various branches of the Catholic Church set it before us.

The first part of the service, the prayers of approach and the Ministry of the Word, has its obvious counterpart in the reading, meditation, and prayer, the faithful discipline of mind and heart, which prepare, support, and condition our life of communion with God. But far more important are the implications, for the priest's own interior life, of that great movement of self-giving and approach to God which begins with the Offertory. The Offertory is now so reduced, and identified with the collection, that we almost forget its great liturgic and spiritual significance. Yet it still represents the actual oblation of the bread and wine, the raw material of communion, which God is to accept and consecrate; and so by implication the offering to Him for His purpose of the whole of our natural life, the cost, the sacrifice without which there is no living prayer: and beyond that, the self-offering of the whole Church in and with Christ her Head, for the giving of more abundant life to the world. So here we have given at once the essential disposition of your soul. For the oblation to God which is made by the priest is so searching and so complete that this ever-renewed act of self-offering must always stand in the foreground of your prayer. "Take, Lord, and receive all my liberty—all I have and possess!" Everything for you is conditioned by this. Your deepest

religious preferences and longings, no less than your human desires, must take second place over against God's demand and your flock's needs. You must often give them the food of Eternal Life in what may seem to you a very crude, unappetizing form; and unite with them in the approach to God which they understand, but from which your temperament and taste recoil. You remember that Thomas à Kempis thought self-offering the one essential preparation for celebrating the Eucharist: "Whatsoever thou givest beside thyself I regard it not: for I look not for thy gifts but for thee."

It is after this oblation, and because of it, that the Church comes to the second great phase of her prayer; when she turns back to the needs of the world and offers that "great intercession" represented in our rite by the prayer for the Church Militant, for all conditions of men. For self-oblation—sacrifice—is the only adequate preparation for the prayer of intercession which prevails with God. It means that our solemn self-offering under tokens is accepted and used by Him. This too must be reflected in the movement of your own interior life. "I will offer the sacrifice of thanksgiving, and put my trust in the Lord." You bring with you the needs of all for whom you pray in your approach to God, and offer yourself, your whole life, for them. Because we are all "one loaf," the sacrificial prayer of even one humble soul does something for all; and this devoted supplication for your people, held up to God with cherishing love, is probably the most effective spiritual instrument of your ministerial work. It is a supernatural action, a necessary part of the Eucharistic life. Intercessory prayer for others completes self-giving prayer to God. It is the stretching out of the arms on the Cross of life, to embrace the world's need; redemptive action. With this double movement established at the heart of your devotion, you are already a tool in the hand of God, possessed by His charity, a channel through which He can work. We are very far yet from realizing what a priest can do for his people in the world of sacrificial, intercessory prayer: bringing all the vicissitudes of life, all their sins, failures, hopes, needs, griefs into relation with the Divine Love.

What comes next? The movement towards Heavenly Places in the Preface and Sanctus: adoration, the vision of Holiness, the recognition of the glory, the otherness of God. Christianity is a religion of contrasts; and Christian prayer too, and especially your prayer, is to embrace the extremes of joy and penitence, the splendour and holiness of God, the littleness and neediness of man—"Glory be to Thee! Have mercy on me!" The right prelude to the mystery of consecration and to

the remembrance of Christ's passion is the vision of the Divine Beauty, and a grateful and awestruck thanksgiving for that beauty; uniting ourselves with the humble yet exultant song of the Seraphim, reminding us of the greatness of that spiritual world enfolding and penetrating us, and within which our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is made. Consecration does not, of course, mean something we do, but something God does. Here, in our secret prayer as well as our liturgic prayer, our action ceases, and His begins. We have offered something. He transforms it; lifts it to a new level of reality, which it could never achieve on its own. A consecrated life, therefore, which must be the goal of your interior prayer, is a life which, having been offered without reserve, is transformed by God; made what it ought to be, a sacrament of His life and love, a means whereby that life and that love are communicated to other souls. It is as sharing in some faint degree in our Lord's High Priestly action, bringing the needs of the world to the altar of God, and going forth from the altar of God bringing bread and wine to the needs of the world, that the Christian priest's life of prayer must be lived. And this rich life of prayer, again and again bringing you close to things infinite and eternal, yet never separating you from the natural life, you shall lift up to God for the manifold needs of men. Here is the mould into which you can pour all your thirst for God, all your self-giving to God, all your love and concern for souls.

EVELYN UNDERHILL.

GERMANIC FAITH MOVEMENTS

THEIR ORIGINS, PRINCIPLES, AND ATTITUDE TOWARDS CHRISTIANITY

LONG before the National Socialist State was established the doctrine of supremacy of the Aryan race (on which the Totalitarian State is built) was alive in "Nordic-Germanic" groups. All over Germany there existed various religious and semi-religious circles advocating a revival of ancient Germanic religion; most of them had never had or else had lost all touch with the Christian Churches. The most influential among these groups were the "Nordic Faith Movement" and the groups around Professor Hauer, called the "German Faith Movement."

When, in the summer of 1933, the Christian Churches in

Germany were busy establishing their position in and their relations with the new State, the "free-religious groups" drew closer together, in order not only to prevent their being crushed between the State and the Churches but to make the most of the moment: they rallied in the "Association of the German Faith Movement" and, under the presidency of Professor Hauer, forwarded a resolution to plead for recognition as a "Third Confession," alongside the Roman Catholic and the Protestant Confessions.

Strong influence was exercised on the "Association of the German Faith Movement" by a number of outstanding men who were not at all or only loosely connected with special movements: Professor Bergmann-Leipzig, author of *Die Deutsche Nationalkirche*; Professor Günther, a specialist for racial problems; Alfred Rosenberg, author of *The Myth of the Twentieth Century*; and Count Reventlow, editor of the *Reichswart*, one of the leading periodicals of the German Faith Movement.

The roots of the various "Movements" go back to the middle of the nineteenth century, some of their ideas even to the Middle Ages. Strange enough that a Frenchman, Count Gobineau, and an Englishman, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, should have initiated these "Germanic" endeavours; on the other hand, this fact shews that some of the doctrines, particularly in the "Nordic Faith Movement," are not confined to Germany alone, still less to the National Socialist State, but embody ideas of an international character. The attitude of intellectual liberalism is in contradiction to National Socialism, whereas, on the other hand, the anti-clericalism, together with the fanatical emphasis laid on the predominance of the Aryan race, aligns these circles with the Government of the Third Reich. Hauer's attempt (July, 1933) to form *one* powerful movement of the various scattered "Germanic" groups, owing to German individualism, was doomed to failure. As early as 1934 this "Association" began to crumble. The "Society for Primeval German History," led by Professor Wirth, dissociated itself; Professors Günther and Bergmann withdrew and the "Nordic Faith Movement," too, regained and maintained a stand of its own, although a number of smaller sects gradually broke away.

Even though there is no unity in their organization and no unison in their ideas, yet the influence of Nordic-Germanic ideas on German men and women is by no means on the decline.*

* It would transgress the limits of this study also to consider the movement run by General Ludendorff and his wife: the former "Tannenberg-Bund," now dissolved by the State. The Ludendorff Publishing House, however, goes busily on fighting Christianity; the circulation of their publications is constantly increasing.

No reliable statistics as to the membership of the "Movements" are available; however, some figures* about the circulation of "Nordic" and "Germanic" periodicals disclose the wide field which their ideas cover in German cultural life.

In the following pages the specific features of the "Nordic Faith Movement" and of the "German Faith Movement" will be presented.

The "Nordic Faith Movement" has expressed its conceptions on Nature, Man, and God in a "Creed" (Nordisches Artbekenntnis†), from which the diffuse substance of this belief can best be illustrated.

This "Movement" aims at a sort of Nordic International; it feels responsible for the religious life of all Nordic races. It has embarked on the task of renewing Nordic Europe, a task which, in its opinion, cannot be performed by States and their political institutions but only by individuals and groups of men and women (the co-operation of women is frequently asked for in this movement) who are imbued with Nordic feeling and Nordic spirit.

The "Creed" does not pretend to embody doctrines of a general or an absolute validity. Nor does it seek, in principle, to fight any existing religion. What it actually stands for is to revive, in Nordic men and women, their inherent racial feeling and, as the outcome of this, their inherent religion.

> "A great creative idea has arisen which is destined to give new life to our nation, to all nations of Nordic blood and thus to the world. A new creative era has begun in the history of the world, having its deepest foundation in this elemental experience of Nordic religion."‡

Frequently, in Nordic circles, it is emphasized that not the fate of Germany only is at stake:

> "Our age is shaken by the most violent spiritual storms, which seem to announce a re-birth of Europe, perhaps a transformation of the whole world."

The nations all over the world, it is held, are now gradually beginning to realize that it is neither language nor culture nor religion that constitutes the life of the community but that

* *Am heiligen Quell deutscher Kraft:* monthly; editor Ludendorff; circulation 72,000. Germanic Faith Movement.—*Der Reichswart:* weekly; editor Count Reventlow; circulation 18,000. *Deutscher Glaube:* monthly; editor Professor Hauer; circulation 4,300. *Durchbruch:* weekly; circulation 16,800. Nordic Faith Movement.—*Nordland:* fortnightly; editor Fridtjof Fischer; circulation 21,300. *Brunnen:* fortnightly; editor Fridtjof Fischer; circulation 6,700.

† Wilhelm Kusserow, *Das Nordische Artbekenntnis*, Flugschriften der Nordischen Glaubensbewegung, Heft 1, Verlag Struppe und Winkler, Berlin, 1934.

‡ This and the following statements are quoted from the above-mentioned study.

there exists another basic element of social and individual life, though hidden by civilization:

> "What is this immanent law of the world, simply felt in the beginning, then coming more and more to the surface of human consciousness?"
>
> "This law of existence . . . lifted the veil from things which hitherto had remained unconscious or were only felt instinctively. Thus it was made possible for us to recognize . . . those natural and necessary hereditary laws which determine all organic life, especially among the human races."

The newly discovered "science of race" and all its consequences, we are told, will be the moving force in life.

Nordic men and women are not troubled by the vagueness of their conception of "race":

> "A race is a section of men and women of largely homogeneous external appearance and internal character who transmit these qualities, more or less completely, to their offspring."

These simple premises admit conclusions of a similar kind. A new conception of history is making headway: many phenomena, the significance of which hitherto was only felt instinctively, in the light of the "science of race" find a new and clear interpretation. The *Myth of the Twentieth Century*, by Alfred Rosenberg, is held to be the standard work for the new racial interpretation of history.

The "Nordic Faith Movement," however, is not primarily concerned with a new outlook on history, nor does it deal with the practical aspects of political and economic regeneration. What it is concerned with is the revival of genuine religious experience, the resurrection of the "Nordic Faith."

> "What is most sacred in man, his religious beliefs, obviously cannot remain unaffected by the revolutionizing consciousness of blood and race. It is precisely in religious life . . . that he comes back to his own race, determined by blood, decreed by God and destined by Nature."

This new religion, the "Creed of the Nordic Race," is presented in a catechetical form of twenty-seven Articles, thus shewing a certain affinity to the "Confessions of Faith" of the Christian Churches. The vagueness of most of the Articles, on the other hand, reminds one of their descent from the "Idealism" and "Romanticism" of the early nineteenth century.

The "Creed" is divided into three parts, which deal with the "Divine," the "Moral," and the "Racial."

It is significant for the character of the "Nordic" religion that, in the "Preamble" to the "Creed," any kind of polarity between "God" and the "World," between "Physics" and "Metaphysics," even between the "Known" and the "Unknown," is deliberately effaced.

> "The Universe is a whole in which the Divine lives in many forms, shapes, powers, and beings, and beyond which there is nothing for Nordic man that he could feel or perceive or think of. This Universe embraces all that can be recognized, felt, and seen. Within the Universe —for there is no without—there are at work forces and powers which we perceive as either doing and creating or undoing and destroying . . . according to their nature. . . ."

Although the "Nordic Faith Movement," in principle, stands for toleration of other religions, in its "Creed" it displays an outspoken animosity against Christianity. To many of the twenty-seven Articles a paragraph is added wherein the Nordic idea is contrasted with the respective Christian one, and generally not to the advantage of the latter.

From the vast and vague field of religious-philosophical doctrines covered by the twenty-seven Articles only a few particularly typical examples will be given, together with the respective Christian counterpart:

Article I.:

> "We believe in the eternal struggle between the creative and the destructive powers on earth and in the universe."

Christian counterpart:

> ". . . The ultimate goal for the Christian religion is eternal peace. 'Nordic' religion, in contrast, means belief in eternal struggle."

Article IV.:

> "We believe and acknowledge that the species (Arten) of men are embodiments of forces which differ in value and duty."

Christian counterpart:

> "Christianity teaches the equality of all men before God. It recognizes no distinction of value in races and seeks to extend its religion over all peoples. . . . It must therefore be called an international religion of equality . . ."

Article VI.:

> " We believe that the will of Nordic men is free according to the elements in their race (nach dem Masse ihrer Art)."

Christian counterpart:

> " Christianity upholds the sinful nature of man and sees sin in the very will of man. As man is a ' fallen ' creature and can only be saved by ' grace,' he possesses neither freedom nor self-responsibility . . ."

The Articles dealing with Nordic Ethics proclaim self-esteeem and pride as the highest values for Nordic men; Christianity is said to have no room for the development of these qualities. " Equality of sexes " is demanded in contrast to Christianity, which degrades women; it is also emphasized that " Labour " is a blessing for mankind and not, as Christianity teaches, a curse and a punishment for men's sinfulness.

Nordic Politics (or the " Racial "), which forms the subject of the third part of the " Catechism," can be summarized in Article XIX.:

> " The States and peoples of Nordic blood, while fully preserving their historic peculiarities, and recognizing the diversity of Germanic languages, must stand by each other's side against all other races for defensive and offensive purposes."

Thus, a " Nordic International " is broadly outlined and its main tasks are said to be the raising of a Nordic race and the guarantee, to all Nordic individuals, of freedom of conscience and of right of personal property.

The " Creed of the Nordic Faith " was drafted one year before National Socialism was established in Germany. Its supporters, in 1932, already claimed " recognition and equal rights with the Christian and Jewish religions in the States and among the nations of Nordic blood."

It stands to reason that many of the conceptions and claims of the " Nordic Faith Movement " are entirely incompatible with the theories of National Socialism. On the other hand a link exists between a " racial " movement and a State based on the doctrine of " blood and soil." The State, on its part, considers these prophets of Race and fighters of the Christian religion and all things Christian to be useful tools for the achievement of political aims.

In its outspoken hostility towards Christianity the " Nordic " Movement differs from the " German Faith Movement," led

by Professor Hauer. This other section of Germanic religion, to a large extent, is shaped and moulded by the personality of its leader and reflects the stages of Hauer's development—*i.e.*, the gradual widening of the gap between Christendom and a new Germanic religious sense of life (Lebensgefühl). Following the course of Hauer's life* we perceive the slow but definite dissociation, first from the Württemberg Pietist circles, the spiritual home of his family; then from the Protestant Christian Church, which sent him as a missionary to India. There he studied Indian philosophy and came home as a teacher and prophet of Indo-Aryan wisdom, which he considered by far superior to the Christian-Semitic religion. The fact, in Hauer's life, that he had been in closest touch with Christian life and teaching, for a long time led him to seek a kind of synthesis of the Indo-Aryan elements of religion and Christianity, purified from Jewish conceptions. The well-known Protestant theologian Adolf Harnack had exercised a strong influence on Hauer, in particular on his attitude towards the personality of Jesus. In the course of the various phases of his religious development Hauer considered Jesus to be, first, the great leader of mankind; subsequently, the friend and comrade, then the great Jew; and finally, the alien Rabbi, whose teaching had neither affinity with nor authority for the soul of Indo-Germanic men. In his present phase, Hauer has given up all attempts at compromising between Christian and Indo-Aryan religion. This, however, does not induce him, personally or on behalf of the "German Faith Movement," to fight Christianity by means of fanatical anti-Christian propaganda, such as is employed by the Ludendorff family and other sections of the new paganism.

As early as 1928, the circles around Hauer (the then Köngener Bund) declared openly that they had reached the point where they could no longer call themselves Christians. When, in 1932, the Papen Government in Germany published a Declaration summoning the German people "to build the new Germany on the unchangeable basis of the Christian world-outlook (Weltanschauung)," Hauer felt the moment come to fight openly for the right of a Germanic religion. "The German people, as a whole, is not Christian," Hauer frankly stated in his periodical, *Kommende Gemeinde*.

It has been mentioned before that, in 1933, Hauer tried to combine the different groups of a new faith and that, this having proved a failure, the "German Faith Movement," in

* A study on Hauer's position in the German religious life is made by Herbert Grabert, *Der Protestantische Auftrag des deutschen Volkes*, Grundzüge der deutschen Glaubensgeschichte von Luther bis Hauer, Stuttgart, 1936.

1934, drew closer together and established its organization on three principles; all members had solemnly to declare:

1. That they were free from Jewish or coloured blood;
2. That they were not members of a Jesuit order, of the Freemasons, or of any secret association;
3. That they also were not members of any other religious movement or organization—(*e.g.*, Christian Churches).

The wide range of ideas in the " German Faith Movement " are lacking in unison. Its diffuse elements may best be traced in one of its standard books, *German Vision of God.** Professor Hauer, in this study, does not embark on the description of a theological system. What he undertakes to do is simply to give a " bio-graphy," a kind of moving picture of the New Faith:

> " Germanic Faith renews itself continuously, it is born anew, time and again; yet its origin is always the same: the Germanic Soul, filled with the Spirit of God." (Foreword.)

Why " Germanic Faith " ? Hauer himself raises the question. Does not religion transgress the boundaries of nations and races ? Although later in the study we learn that blood is the source of all things spiritual, the author points out that the term " Germanic Faith " by no means implies an undue feeling of superiority:

> " We are taking a great responsibility in connecting ' Germanic ' with ' Faith.' These words, for us, are a symbol, they imply a vocation . . . to work in the service of superhuman forces . . ." (Preamble.)

The vagueness of this and of many other statements is characteristic of the " German Faith Movement," which, frequently and emphatically, has refused to commit itself to any sort of " doctrine " or " system." No definite and logically linked ideas but floating and ever-changing conceptions, that is the character of the Movement and its basic book. Three loosely connected groups of ideas can be traced: (1) An historical survey of the origins of the Germanic Faith; (2) an analysis of its essential items; (3) a confrontation of the new religion with Christianity and other religions.

An attempt is made to outline (1) the *development* of Germanic religion during a millennium. For this purpose Hauer divides the globe into three geographical regions: the Far East, the Near East (as far as it is populated by Semitic races), and

* Wilhelm Hauer, *Deutsche Gottschau*, Grundzüge eines Deutschen Glaubens, Verlag Gutbrod, Stuttgart, 1935.

the "Indo-Germanic zones," which are said to stretch from the north-west of India to the Atlantic. Dismissing the Far East from his considerations, Hauer confronts the geological and biological conditions of the Semitic and the Germanic zones and the religions resulting from these conditions. Although this part is introduced by the statement:

> "It is generally known that the term 'Indo-Germanic' is not a term for race but for language and culture only . . ."

yet, strangely enough, throughout the study the Indo-Germanic countries are considered to form one "biological" unit, whose soul was shaped and moulded by its immense geographical variety. The abundance of nature produced a corresponding abundance of symbolic deities and religious emotions, all of which, however, never crystallized in "Scriptures" but remained floating through the "Myths" and "Sagas."

The atmosphere of desert and of barren mountains in Semitic regions, on the other hand, created a race, stern, monotonous, violent and imperious in character, with its corollary, an ascetic and gloomy Monotheism (Judaism, Christianity, and Islamism). Once in the course of the millennium, however (and this is one of the crucial points in Hauer's thesis), a kind of pseudo-synthesis took place between these two geo-biological extremes, namely in Rome, when Semitic Christendom met with Indo-Germanic political forces with their marked proclivity to unification and centralization:

> "Thus the Ecclesiastical State of Roman Catholicism came into being. . . . From the confrontation of the Church and the Germanic Imperium there arose a conflict of universal significance. . . ."

We are told that the coming into existence of an Ecclesiastical-political state, imbued with Roman and Semitic spirit, doomed Germanic countries to live under alien sovereignty for almost a thousand years, and, consequently, to lose their creative religious forces. But the Germanic character, although seriously endangered by the Christian religion, yet was strong enough to resist its influence and finally to shake it off. This, however, took a long time. Throughout a thousand years the Germanic spirit struggled with the alien spirit of Christendom. Time and again the soul of the race shook off the fetters of "Semitic-Roman-Catholic" tutelage. The growth of Mysticism, later of Humanism, and, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, of "German Idealism," are said to be but manifestations of a permanent revolution against alien supremacy.

"Meister Eckhart" is considered an unconscious forerunner of Germanic religion; Martin Luther, and, later, Herder, Goethe, and Schleiermacher, are conscious pioneers of a reborn Germanic Faith:

> "In spite of the fact that the Reformation returned to Christianity it yet reconquered the independence of conscience. . . . German Idealism is the final victory. *No relapse into Christianity will take place again.* . . ."
>
> "Goethe is the full realization of 'the German Man.' . . . Eckhart and Goethe are the two sign-posts pointing towards a new Germanic religion—the one opened the inner domain of the soul, the other gained the Universe. . . . Thus the alien world (of Rome) was conquered."

The final link in the chain of struggles against the tyranny of Palestine and Rome is the Revolution of 1933. Adolf Hitler, it is held, joins the rank and file of liberators from spiritual and political foreign rule.

Another part of the *Deutsche Gottschau* presents us with the analysis of (2) the *elements* of the new faith. It is by no means insignificant that the first and last chapter of this part deals with questions of blood and race.

"Blood is sacred. . . . It contains, from ancient times, the regenerating mystery of families, tribes, and peoples. . . . The origin of the spirit is in the blood. . . ."

The new ethics of Germanic Men, we are told, also emerge from blood and race, they "dwell in our blood and are at work there." No Commandments and Holy Scriptures, therefore, are necessary in Germanic countries. The *spoken* word only is full of life-blood and draws new strength from everyone who passes it on.

"Germanic" ethics breaks with the "Semitic" idea of original sin, of man being wicked in his very nature and, consequently, in need of redemption through Christ. The idea of human guilt is maintained but transformed into a natural fate:

> "There would be no true development without guilt. . . . We are capable to bear our guilt for the reason that, through this very guilt, we come to a genuine, free, and happy life. . . ."

Germanic men are also not afraid of death nor do they crave for a brighter future after death.

> "Any longing for an existence after death is drowned in the pious devotion to the present."

Resentment against forms of a gloomy and unworldly Christianity, in the circles of the German Faith Movement, often

tends to falsify not only Christian ideas* but also a philosophy which was (in the days of "Mysticism" and "German Idealism") genuine and sublime. The triviality of many of the statements and "Articles of Faith" is a disgrace not only to those who pronounce them, but even more to the sources from which they are derived.

The most sublime conception, in ethics, we are told, is the "Sacrament of the Birth of the Nation":

> "We use the expression 'Sacrament' according to its original meaning, it being a sacred obligation . . . to serve eternal powers. In fulfilling this mission we meet God."

From here the German Faith Movement proceeds to an emphatic affirmation of the existing State:

> "In the State the original will of a people is embodied. Our affirmation of the State, therefore, is Religion."

Consequently, it is not essential whether or not wicked deeds are done in the name and for the sake of the State:

> "We think that a man who does not dare to tackle a thing for the sole reason that he wants to 'keep his hands clean' is an egoistic fellow."

The Germanic conceptions of ethical life, according to Hauer, can be summarized thus: The natural "instincts" of men are not, as Christianity teaches, opposed to the claims of "Spirit," but are "manifestations of the very same eternal reality."

In what Hauer himself calls the "central" chapter of his book, he deals in particular with the "Vision of God." Germanic Faith represents a synthesis of monotheism and polytheism. The soul of an Indo-Germanic man feels the presence of God in Nature, and he gives to the forces he meets there the symbolic names of Gods, although realizing that there is only *one* moving force behind the visible world, *one* Deity behind the innumerable Gods. Germanic Faith thus pretends to bridge the age-old controversy between "Immanence" and "Transcendence," between God "within" and God "beyond":

> "There is a great eternal Ego that lives within all things existing. This Ego lives also in Man. . . . He who embodies this entity . . . is ready to risk everything and to resist everything. . . ."

* The statement that sin and evil are in origin "Semitic" conceptions does not stand historical criticism. It should be borne in mind that in pre-Socratic philosophy as well as in Indian teaching, the very quality of life is regarded to be evil. This, the pessimistic angle of the Indo-Germanic world-outlook, is considerably neglected by Hauer.

It is noteworthy (with regard to the actual political situation) that the Germanic Faith upholds the thesis of the "Divine Profoundness of Man" (Die göttliche Tiefe des Menschen) as one of the fundamental conceptions both of Indian and Nordic-Germanic philosophy.

There is much inconsistency in Part III., where Hauer confronts Christianity with the new Germanic Faith. On the one hand it is admitted that good Germans can be pious Christians, too, and that no member of the German Faith should prevent these Christians from living according to their belief, and even from teaching and spreading it. On the other hand, objection is made whenever this religious right should tend

> "to become an Ecclesiastical institution with a claim for pre-eminence in the German nation. . . ."
>
> "Today in German schools the Christian faith is being taught. We do not consider this compatible either with the true meaning of the Gospel of Jesus or with a Germanic sense of life. . . . The German State is established on a Germanic basis and on nothing else. Viewed from this angle there exists no such thing as a 'Christian' school or a 'Christian' army or a 'Christian' university, but only a 'German' school, a 'German' army, and a 'German' university. . . ."

The various attempts to "Germanize" Christianity (Deutschkirche, Deutsche Christen, etc.) are rejected and said to be fruitless compromises between "Germanic" ideas and a religion containing too many "Semitic" elements.

Whenever, in Hauer's opinion, religion and politics are mixed with the purpose of strengthening the influence of the Church and

> ". . . whenever attempts are made to influence and to rule parts of the German people from outside, there will be but one answer and one call: 'Fight to the Last.'"

Although the "German Faith" does not lack genuine enthusiasm and intuitive methods of thought, Professor Hauer's book reveals some serious incompatibilities and contradictions, which are also reflected in the Movement as a whole. It has been mentioned before that the term "Indo-Germanic" is used by Hauer in an unscholarly way. This fact actually upsets the racial theories and slogans that rule the Movement. If "Indo-Germanic," by Hauer, is admitted to be a linguistic and not a biological term, there is no such thing as a "racial" faith. Moreover, the fact that the "German Faith Movement"

not only tolerates political and religious persecutions in Germany but directly attacks the Churches and the Christian Faith, reveals the gap between the ideology it pretends to stand for and the political system on which it depends and which it desires to further. And there is no doubt that the leader of the Movement identifies himself and his followers entirely with the Totalitarian State: "With the Third Reich we stand and we fall."

In the spring of 1936 the German public was taken by surprise by the news that both Professor Hauer and Count Reventlow had resigned their leading posts in the German Faith Movement. It had long been known that both men had not been in favour of the growing tendency, in the Movement, to fight Christianity and the Christian Churches by all means possible. Hauer and Reventlow, on their part, considered the principal task to be the awakening of a genuine Germanic religion which, in its turn, would gradually overcome the alien faith and institutions. It seems likely, though there is no basis yet for definite statement, that their resignation was not a protest only against the radical methods and aims but rather a yielding to pressure brought against them from outside. The German Faith Movement, soon after the loss of its leaders, passed a resolution not to elect a new president but to carry on its work under a "Committee." It is also known that on this committee there are some of the most radical fighters against Christianity. A former editor of the Ludendorff Publishing House, Kurth, had joined the Movement some time ago and become editor of the *Durchbruch*, one of the radical periodicals of the organization.* There is the possibility that the Ludendorff family may lay hands on the "German Faith Movement" and gradually absorb it in its own destructive rather than religious work.

To all appearances the development has come to a turning-point. There are three alternatives: Will the German Faith Movement, sincere in many of its representatives and even embodying some conceptions of true religion, be strong enough to stand for its original principles of freedom for religion and for the individual? Will it be run down by fanatics, like the "Nordic" Faith Movement, and get lost in an unspiritual fight against Christianity? Or will it eventually be crushed by the political forces with which it has irrevocably linked its fate?

E. M. MOULDER.

* The last news is that Hans Kurth, too, has departed from the German Faith Movement and, together with another former follower of Hauer, Dr. Grabert, launched a new "Movement" of the same kind as the German Faith Movement.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF THE DANISH REFORMATION, 1536-1936

On October 30, 1936, the Danish Church celebrated the 400th anniversary of its Reformation. On October 30, 1536, the *Herredag* (Parliament) at Copenhagen passed the Recess which abolished the ancient episcopate with its association of temporal and spiritual power, and demanded the introduction of a new ecclesiastical order with "other Christian bishops and superintendents, who should instruct the multitude of the people, teach and preach the holy Gospel and God's Word and the holy Christian faith." The Recess does not, however, contain a whole new Church Order—it deals only with episcopal property, monasteries, and tithes—but provides that the King and the Council (*Riges Raad*) should "with the help of various wise and learned men set up a new Order." This happened with the promulgation of the *Kirkeordinanse* (the Church Order of the Danish Reformation); with this Ordinance the new bishops went out on their visitations: it was their authorization and their instructions.

There is every reason, therefore, at the commemoration of the Danish Reformation to call to mind this old Church code. Even though J. Oskar Andersen can say that much of its programme was only "promises on paper," yet it is also true that "the *Church Ordinance* was a fine piece of work, filled with a truly evangelical spirit. The fact that this law was the foundation of our Church's history for 150 years is sufficient evidence of this; and even today we still stand in many respects on the foundation then laid."*

On St. Martin's Day, 1536, the King issued a summons to a *Generale Concilium* at Odense, "that learned men from the whole kingdom should come together to establish a good Reformation and an alteration of the non-Christian ceremonies and abuses, which were maintained in the holy Church in the time of the old kings and until now." This Commission on the Church law was composed of the most respected evangelical preachers, and elected members frøm the still existing Cathedral Chapters. This Council met in the beginning of 1537, first at Odense, and then, after it had been enlarged to include some evangelical preachers from Schleswig, at Haderslev. The result of the Council's work was a draft of a Church Order, in Latin. The draft was revised by the King, and with his alterations and additions was sent to Wittenberg to be revised

* H. F. Rørdam, *Kirkeleksikon for Norden*, ii. 800.

by Luther and the other reformers. In July the Pomeranian reformer, Dr. Johannes Bugenhagen, whom Christian III. had invited to help in the work of the Reformation, arrived, bringing with him the draft with Luther's approval. After a further revision the Ordinance received the King's assent on September 2, 1537.

However, this Latin Church law was not always equally easy to carry out in practice. In 1539 it was translated into Danish, and was accepted by the *Herredag* at Odense in 1539. It was printed in 1542 with the title "The right Ordinance, which now at length by the *Herredag* at Odense is translated and ratified: How the Church Service shall be held in the Kingdoms of Denmark and Norway and the Duchy of Schleswig-Holstein."

We shall let the *Church Ordinance* speak, as far as is possible, in its own words. These are the best evidence of what the Reformation was intended to be: it is another matter how far the intentions were realized. If at the 400th anniversary we are to revive and restore our inheritance from the Reformation, one of the first things needful is that, amid the clamour of other and lesser voices, we should listen to what the Reformation's own documents have to say.

"Since God our Lord hath quieted the wars and alarms which have newly arisen in our time, and hath given Us Our grandfather's and Our father's kingdom to rule and to govern, it is Our greatest and chiefest will and desire,* that We should raise up from its fall the doctrine of Jesus Christ our Lord and the right and true Christian worship. . . . By reason of this We have summoned learned men and preachers from the churches in Denmark and Our Duchies, and have commanded them to draw up for Us a Christian Ordinance concerning which We might take counsel. And to this same Ordinance We have made Our reply, and have sent it to our worthy father, Doctor Martin Luther. . . .

"But in order that such a godly work might more rightly go forward, We have desired of the noble Prince Johan Frederick, Duke of Saxony, Kurfurst, etc., Our good friend, to send to Us of his charity Hans Bugenhagen of Pomerania, a Doctor in the Holy Scriptures; and this same learned man's counsel and help we have used for the completing of this holy Ordinance: That men may know that We have not been self-willed nor have acted hastily in this work, but have used so many and distinguished assistants. . . .

"Two matters are treated of in this Ordinance. The first relates only to God, which is that We will have God's Word, which is the Law and the Gospel, rightly preached, the Sacraments rightly administered, the children well taught. . . . This indeed is not for Us to ordain, but thereby We desire to serve the ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ. He

* Here the King refers to his Proclamation, in which he had promised "first above all things to love and serve Almighty God, and to serve, set forward, maintain, uphold, defend and shield His holy Word and doctrine" (H. F. Rordam, *Danske Kirkelove*, i., p. 1).

has Himself revealed and given to us the Gospel in the world, which formerly from before all ages had been hid in God. And He commanded that this Gospel should be preached to every creature. So He instituted Baptism and the holy Sacrament of the Altar, which He commanded to be distributed and to be received according to His own institution and not otherwise. Contrary to that Gospel and that Institution of Christ one must listen to no man, nor do anything, no, not even if it were an angel from heaven, as Paul dares to say. Councils and human Ordinances might here do nothing against God's ordinance. But, for this Gospel whereby God is praised and glorified, the anti-Christian party have given us a diabolical doctrine. . . . They have given us Duties and Penances for sins, Statutes, monastic rules, observances, indulgences, pilgrimages, brotherhoods, their supposed sacrifice, their abominable Masses, purgatory, holy water, appointed fast-days, useless hours of prayer, vigils for the dead, holy places, christening of bells, anointings, incense, holy vestments, their impure chastity, the forswearing of matrimony, which nevertheless God Himself hath appointed and instituted, the forbidding of meat, the forbidding of the chalice of Christ's blood; the invocation of saints, the abuses which they have introduced in all the works and ceremonies whereby they have taught us that we might be reconciled to God, and do duties and penances for sins, and so merit the forgiveness of sins.

"They claimed indeed to know God, as Paul saith: but by these teachings and acts they denied that true and holy Gospel, Jesus Christ's blood and God the Father's forgiveness, since they let not the forgiveness of sins be simply and only for Jesus Christ's sake.

"These anti-Christian teachings, these lies and betrayals We send now back again to the devil from whom they have come, and We give God the glory, receiving Christ's true Gospel. So also We let the Sacraments be given and received rightly according to Christ's own institution.

"So far We have spoken of those things which belong to God's own ordinance and order: which indeed shall not be called Ours, as also it is not to be by any man infringed or transgressed. And We order it to be upheld, for therein We are obedient to our Lord Jesus Christ, who has appointed and commanded that same ordinance, to His glory and to our salvation.

"But the second part of Our ordinance may be said to be Ours, though it also relates to God, since therein changes may be made without dishonour to God: namely that We have ordained concerning persons, times, places, language, customs, the hours of prayer, music and ceremonies . . . not without due cause, and not with any special claim to sanctity, but in the service of that true ordinance of God of which We have spoken, that it might the better be upheld in secure dignity. For all such things must serve the Word of God."

In this royal brief the programme of the Danish Reformation finds expression. Extracts will make it easy to see the general line. In the first place it is not a matter of abolishing an "old" (catholic) and instituting a "new" (evangelical) Church. "For Christian III. and his contemporaries the Danish Church stood as an existing reality, as the Church of Jesus Christ: any thought of 'founding Churches' was wholly strange to them. On the contrary, they understood that changes might

be made, in such a way that the order of the Danish Church might correspond with its nature."* It is the existing Danish Church, which now by legislation emanating from the King and the Council goes through a process of purification undertaken with the authority of God's Word, which is necessary because of the infringement of the Gospel and Institution of Jesus Christ by the "anti-Christian party" (*i.e.*, the Roman Church).

It would, however, be a mistake if, from the circumstance that the initiative in this process of purification was taken by King and Council and not by the Bishops, one were to see here "the foundation of a State Church." When the King appears as a Reformer of the Church, it is not as the representative of a "civil power" which assumes authority over a Church that is independent of the civil power. The mediæval view, which was fully shared by the Reformers, is not that, as in the days of the early Church, the Church stood as the *Civitas Dei* in the midst of a pagan state, "the city of the devil": for since the nations as a whole had become Christian, the States were Christian States. Church and State were thus not two independent spheres, but coincided, as spheres, in one and the same "Christian Order." But within this one Christian Order of which properly the ruler is God Himself, Church and State are two spheres of rule, which have received from God the nature of their respective authorities, the temporal and the spiritual.

In the ordinary way these two functions, in the Reformer's view, are held in clear distinction: the one may not encroach on the other's sphere. But in an emergency, when, for instance, the spiritual power fails to fulfil its function, namely, to proclaim the Word of God—it can become not only a right but a duty for the temporal power to put in its hand and see that the Word of God is proclaimed without hindrance. For the temporal power also has been ordained of God for His service. It was on this ground that the Reformers asserted the right of the Prince in an ecclesiastical emergency, when the spiritual rule of the Bishops had failed to fulfil its function, to take over the function of the spiritual power and reorganize a new spiritual rule.

It is this same line of thought that underlies Christian III.'s royal brief in the *Ordinance*. He acts in his activity as Reformer, not as a "statesman," but as a Christian Prince (*cf.* his Proclamation), who has an office to perform entrusted to him to perform within the "Christian Order." This function of his not only empowers him, but compels him in the actual situation, when the spiritual power or episcopate has failed in its duty, to put in his hand and provide a new order. Thus we see, too, that the King's initiative and interference in the work of the

* J. O. Andersen, *Reformationens Begyndelse og Hans Tausen*, pp. 53-54.

Reformation is "Jesus Christ's ordinance," to which his own ordinance cannot but serve, and to which it subordinates itself. Jesus Christ's ordinance, however, is the Scripture that is preached, and the Sacraments. Hence the King does not carry through reforms in a "self-willed" or "hasty" way, but commits to learned, spiritual men, having knowledge of the Scriptures, the task of preparing the draft of the programme of the Reform.

Hence it is no encroachment of the State on the Church: it is rather that the lay element in the Church, represented by the King, in the situation created by the failure of the Spiritualty, carries through a Reformation according to God's Word. Naturally we should not deny that from time to time political considerations also made themselves felt. A reformation of the Church involving the abolition of the temporal power of the Episcopate could not fail to have important political consequences. But the actual words of the *Ordinance* make it clear that the ruling consideration was the Christian Prince's "greatest and chiefest will and desire, that we should raise up from its fall the doctrine of Jesus Christ our Lord and the right and true Christian worship," under compulsion from the authority which flows from "Jesus Christ's Ordinance."

The first chapter of the *Ordinance* deals with the "doctrine which serves us for our salvation." This is thus expressed in the manner of the Reformation: "From now onward the whole evangelical teaching shall everywhere be pure, wise, and uniform among all, and for all things shall be emphasized with zeal and energy that article on Man's Justification, that every man may understand what Faith is, and what saves him." At the same time it is strongly asserted with regard both to the Gospel and to the Sacraments that the evangelical preaching "altogether demands true penitence and amendment, faith and her fruits, which are good works."

To help preachers to give substance to their preaching, the *Ordinance* puts out fifteen Articles, round which preaching is always to gather itself, "that speech may not wander hither and thither, having neither head nor conclusion." They are: On God's Law and the Fear of God, on the Gospel and Faith in God, on Penitence, how man shall deliver himself and amend, on the Cross, on Prayer, on Good Works, on Free Will, on Christian Freedom, on God's eternal Predestination, on Human Invention, on Authority and Dominion, on Marriage, on the Saints, on Fasting, on Images. It is interesting that the *Ordinance*, like the Augsburg Confession, reckons Penance among the Sacraments.

The second chapter, "On Ceremonies and the outward Church Service," is the longest and most important section of the *Ordinance*. Here, too, it is as clear as possible that there is no desire to introduce a new order, but to "purify" the old. To a large extent the Latin language is retained in the Church Service, as it continued to be as late as 1683; the traditional services were retained with their Latin chants, sung by the school children, with the addition of a sermon or other provision for the Christian instruction of the young. The Davidic Psalter in Latin still retained its place in the Danish Church. In cathedrals and monasteries the recitation of the Breviary was continued with the omission of the propers for Saints.

Of the greatest interest is the order for "high mass" according to the *Ordinance*: it is not regarded as the chief preaching service, but it really is the liturgy of the altar, "since the Mass is nothing else but the use of the Lord's Supper to the comforting of troubled consciences and the proclaiming of Christ's death." So there is to be "High Mass" on Sunday for them that will be prepared to receive, in the accustomed vestments, at an altar spread with linen, with the usual chalice and paten and lighted candles."

"The minister who celebrates the Mass shall fall on his knees before the altar, and recite to himself the *Confiteor* (the confession of sins which introduces the service in the Roman rite). . . . Then he shall continue the Mass in the accustomed manner, yet so that it be not defiled with any word that speaks of sacrifice or men's works, as has been done in the Pope's Church with idolatry and defilement." After this the outline of the service is given: Introit, which is either to be in the Latin form, taken from the Roman Mass, or a Danish psalm (the latter especially in country places); *Kyrie* and *Gloria* in Latin or Danish; Salutation and Collect in Danish; Epistle in Danish; *Alleluia* as in the Roman Mass, followed by a Danish psalm to replace the Gradual of the Roman Mass, with sequences on festivals; the Gospel in Danish; the Nicene Creed in Latin, followed by a versified Danish translation, *Vi tro allesammen paa en Gud*; the Sermon; and finally the approach to the altar, followed by the Blessing. The elevation of the consecrated elements and the ringing of the bell are retained as in the Roman Mass. Where there are none who are prepared to receive, the Priest is to end the service, but wear only an alb without a chasuble, and stand not at the altar but at a "prayer desk."

It is thus an extremely conservative reformation of the traditional Catholic rite that is envisaged by the *Ordinance*. It is as far as possible from the introduction of what is usually

understood as a modern "Protestant" service. A service carried out according to the directions of the *Ordinance* would doubtless strike a modern Protestant as extremely "Catholic."

One section is devoted to preaching, the sphere which the Reformation specially made its own. The preacher is to expound and proclaim God's Word. "Neither is he to stand up and speak his own notions, but that which he receives to say, that he is to express in clear and intelligible words." "Nor yet is he to upbraid the Papists and speak evil of them, unless he be constrained thereto for the sake of exposition and example."

An important subject is the education of the young in Christian doctrine. "Nor yet is anyone to exhibit here his own wisdom and cleverness, but all things are to be done for the edification of the Church."

"We accept not Holy Days, but ordinary Sundays, in order that the people may rest from work on one day of the week, hear God's Word, receive the Sacraments all together with one another, pray to God for all their needs, and thank Him for His mercies." Nevertheless the *Ordinance* retains, besides the great Church seasons, the following Holy Days: New Year's Day, the Day of the Three Kings, Candlemas, the Annunciation, Ascension Day, the Visitation, John the Baptist's Day, St. Michael's Day, All Saints' Day, and the Apostles' Days, which are celebrated on the following Sunday, likewise St. Mary Magdalene and St. Laurence.

Private Confession is retained in the *Ordinance*, and as we have said, is reckoned among the sacraments. In distinction from the Catholic Shrift is the following: "Here it is not required that all sins should be mentioned, or anything like that, but that a man should tell enough to quiet his sore conscience."

The third chapter, about Schools, is that which most of all bears the mark of its period. We could scarcely be satisfied with the pedagogical principles which the *Ordinance* contains: "Neither is anything to be taught in them except Latin, because Latin Schools are too often set aside by the Danish and German Schools, and so they who read Greek and Hebrew seek more their own advantage and advancement than that of the scholars: which indeed is evident of itself." The school-books are all to be Latin: Donatus and Cato, Philip's Grammar, *Æsop's Fables*, Terence, Cicero, Virgil, and others. The time-table is as follows: 6-8, Grammar (Latin !); 8, Divine service in the church, followed by Catechism and a break; 12, Singing (an important subject, for the sake of the divine service); 1, Latin reading;

2, Divine service in the church; 3 and 4, more Latin exercises. The whole of Saturday is devoted to religious teaching, in which not only the Catechism but also the reading of the Scriptures takes an important place.

In the fourth and fifth chapters, devoted respectively to parochial finance and the episcopal office, the new ordering of Church property and the functions of the ministry are described: this section is in general just as conservative as the rest.

The short seventh chapter deals with the theme: "Of certain sinful ways, which country priests may have." Here the priests are exhorted to avoid "bad books" and apply themselves to good reading. "They should above all else have the Holy Bible, which is a source of all right-minded Godliness. Next, Dr. Martin Luther's *Postilla*. . . . Third, Philip's *Apologia* (Melanchthon's defence of the Augsburg Confession), in which all the sound doctrine of the Christian faith is contained and proved and given to the understanding with Christian reasons. . . . Fourth, the *Loci communes Philippi* (Melanchthon's chief work of dogmatic theology, the "Loci") in which the most important and necessary articles and passages in the Scripture are most easily and happily expounded." Further, Luther's Catechism is enjoined, and the Saxon Visitation Articles.

With regard to canons, monks, and nuns, it is said, in accordance with the Recess, that they have liberty to leave their convents: but they may also remain there, on the condition that they will preach and hear God's Word, and serve God in an evangelical way in their convents. An appendix to the *Ordinance* contains an evangelical Breviary for use in the convents, made out by Bugenhagen. Another liturgical appendix contains a Form for the Consecration of Bishops.

The *Ordinance* was, as we have said, only a programme. It soon became clear that there were difficulties in the execution of the programme, and that it needed to be both supplemented and corrected. The work of the carrying out of the programme is well illustrated in Peter Palladius' *Visitation Book*, where we see a "right" bishop travelling round his diocese, with the *Ordinance* in his hand, to carry out purification and reformation "according to God's Word."

At the 400th anniversary of the Reformation, it would be an unprofitable occupation to lament that the "promises" were not all fulfilled. But it would not be a great deal better if we were to confine ourselves to jubilation over the wonderful blessings which we believe that the Reformation has brought us. For, rightly understood, the Reformation is *only* a programme: the Church ordered according to God's Word. Indeed,

our celebration of the anniversary might well consist simply in a renewed application of the programme. For it is possible that we in Denmark have gone far astray from the programme; it is probable, indeed, that we are quite as far away from the ideal of a Church ordered according to the Gospel only as was the Catholicism of the later Middle Ages.

Both our preaching and our liturgical life are sorely in need of a "reformation according to God's Word." It is likely that the carrying out of such a programme in the present day would differ widely on certain points from that of the sixteenth-century reformers. It is possible, for example, that we need a considerable dose of Catholicism in a Lutheranism from which the Sacraments and the disciplined life of prayer are in danger of disappearing. But that lies beyond our present scope.

The question which is set to us in Denmark this year is the simple question whether we will accept the programme of the Reformation, and make our effort in accordance with it. Thanksgiving for the Reformation has indeed its due place: we *are* to thank God for the Reformation, and that in Church. But it will be well if in place of a too vigorous exultation we use the commemoration of the Reformation to try out our energies in putting into practice the demands made by the *Ordinance*. We shall find that we shall have enough to do for many years to come, to "carry through" the Reformation and make the Danish Church to be one that really is "reformed according to God's Word."

REGIN PRENTER.

NOVEMBER THE FIFTH

A COLD PLUNGE INTO THE BATH OF HISTORY, RECOMMENDED TO BRACE THE NERVES OF WHIGS AND TO CLEANSE THE CANT OF PRIGS

IT is a great mistake ever to set down anything on paper. By so doing, you deliver yourself into the adversary's hand, as Frank Tresham did in 1605. Had he not written a letter to his kinsman, Lord Monteagle, that was either foolishly treacherous or else sinfully indiscreet, the events of November 5 would probably have taken a very different course. Further, since it is at least arguable that human judgment follows the logic of events, our judgment of what we now call the Gunpowder Treason might well have reached a very different conclusion.

As for the events, the wisest fool in Christendom would have lost his chance of repeating on English soil that exhibition which he had already given in Scotland of the wisdom of his folly. He would have ascended straight to the upper floor of what Dr. Major calls the three-storey universe with untimely celerity, twenty years early for his appointment with nature. He might also have taken with him the author of his premature salvation; for though that cool warrior in the cellar was provided with a slow match timed to burn for fifteen minutes, accidents will happen when you play with fireworks. Had everything occurred as I have suggested, it is not impossible that the Fifth of November might have been counted the celestial birthday of Blessed Guido Fawkes. For, on Totalitarian principles, as I shall try to show, the only scandal of the Gunpowder Treason was its failure to achieve its object.

Guy Fawkes was an Englishman, of good Yorkshire stock, son of Edward Fawkes of York, an advocate of the consistory court of the Archbishop of York. He thus enjoyed a hereditary connection with ecclesiastical law, if not with moral theology. The Archbishop at the time of Guy's birth was attached to the Elizabethan reform, and the worthy advocate was a Protestant, whose practice doubtless lay chiefly in testamentary and matrimonial causes, and disputes about tithe.

The date of Guy's nativity was 1570. At the beginning of that year a notable assassination had taken place in Scotland. The regent Moray, the most unpleasant half-brother of the imprisoned Mary, Queen of Scots, was very deservedly shot in the streets of Linlithgow. The delight of his half-sister, the Catholic Queen, was expressed by the conferment of a pension on the assassin.

Unfortunately, Elizabeth sent an army into Scotland and prevented Mary's supporters from reaping the harvest which had thus been sown. In the same year, the Pope declared, by the bull *Regnans in Excelsis*, that Elizabeth was illegitimate (which she had already been pronounced to be both by Cranmer and by Parliament in 1536), also excommunicate and diabolical; her subjects were released from their allegiance, her person was outcast from civilization in this world and her soul from salvation in the next. The bull contained a direct incitement to insurrection, which failed in its purpose only because the Emperor and the Kings of France and Spain refused to execute it.

A more successful stroke was dealt at Protestantism in France, two years later, when Catharine de Medici and the Guises carried out the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in which three or four thousand Huguenots were liquidated in Paris

alone. The completeness of the massacre exceeded all expectations, and mutual congratulations ensued. France sent to the Pope the unique gift of Admiral Coligny's head; the Pope struck a special medal and conferred on France the exceptional tribute of the Golden Rose.

Guy Fawkes was still too young to be much influenced by these events. But as he grew in wisdom and stature, there was no lack of stirring examples to impress upon his mind the political effectiveness of direct Action. In 1581 William, Prince of Orange, himself a pretty unscrupulous champion of the Protestant cause in the Netherlands, was put to the ban of the Empire, and a price was placed on his head. Three years later, in 1584, he was shot at Delft. In 1588 Henry III. of France had the inconvenient, interfering Duke of Guise and his brother the Cardinal of Lorraine removed by the dagger, thereby conserving the last vestige of a vanishing authority. Next year he was himself fatally stabbed outside his rebellious capital of Paris. The hand that slew him was that of a fledgling Dominican, who was intolerantly filled with the religious enthusiasm of youth. Assassination, in fact, was a normal instrument of policy. There was then no Kellogg Pact.

No one would have been surprised to hear that Queen Elizabeth had suffered the same fate. She herself told Parliament in 1586 that only by a miracle was she still alive. In the same year the French ambassador at Rome wrote thus concerning her to his master the King of France: "She cannot doubt that at every moment some attempt will be made on her life, and that she cannot again enjoy an hour of safety or of pleasure." The Pope admitted that proposals had been made to him, on occasions, for her assassination; he had, however, rejected them with abhorrence. Rome had incited to civil war, which would have brought misery on the whole country, but drew the line at an isolated murder.

This moderation was generally felt to be not only unpractical, but unlikely to be observed by the more idealistic elements in the political Opposition. Common prudence bound the English Government to treat the Jesuit missionaries roughly. In keeping with the spirit of the times, it proceeded to treat Mary, the Queen of Scots, roughly also. That tragic lady was kept a prisoner by Elizabeth for nearly nineteen years, without any shadow of legality, and in varying degrees of discomfort and indignity, simply because her freedom would have been embarrassing to England. Towards the end of that period Elizabeth's Secretary of State, the pious Puritan Sir Francis Walsingham, gave final proof that the policy and virtue of Action were not a Popish monopoly. Queen Mary

was Elizabeth's nearest heir to the English throne, so that her very existence provided a focus for every Romanist conspiracy. She had herself undoubtedly intrigued against Elizabeth, by entering into plots to break her prison. Walsingham decided to present her with a ready-made plot of his own and deliver her from durance for ever.

His plot was entirely successful. He planted an agent of his own among a group of conspirators who, from motives of romance, religion, and undergraduate recklessness, had determined to assassinate Elizabeth and free Mary. It is practically certain that he even instigated the conspiracy itself. At any rate, he carefully implicated Mary in it, and was supplied with copies of her correspondence. When the hour was ripe, he arrested the conspirators and demanded Mary's blood. Queen Mary was put on trial. The evidence was clearly insufficient to condemn her. She was nevertheless condemned.

At this point a serious hitch occurred in the proceedings. Unlike Oliver Cromwell in the next century, whose blood was not monarchical but middle-class, Elizabeth thought it politically undesirable and personally revolting to cut off a royal head. She twisted and squirmed and procrastinated. Walsingham was still equal to the occasion. Neither he nor Elizabeth felt the Pope's abhorrence of murder, so they sent a message to Sir Amias Paulet, Mary's very ungentle gaoler, suggesting the obvious advantages which would accrue to all parties if he had his prisoner privately assassinated. But Paulet knew his masters, and had no mind, after acting as their butcher, to become also their scapegoat. The unfortunate Elizabeth was compelled at last to have her royal cousin executed in due form.

Guy Fawkes was seventeen at this triumph of Action over abstract justice. He must have found it most impressive.

Other influences, however, than those of politics assisted in the direction of his mind. His father, the Protestant advocate, died, and his mother married again. The object of her second affections was probably a Romanist himself, and was certainly connected with a number of Romanist families. Presumably herein lies the reason why Guy embraced with ardour the Roman faith and cause. This step involved important consequences. It disabled Guy from employments which he might have expected in his native country. He could neither serve the State nor, after the Armada, easily engage in active operations for its overthrow. The English Romanists were temporarily dispensed from their spiritual obligation to rebellion and settled down for the most part as loyal subjects. Men of unreformed mediæval faith fought for Elizabeth in 1588 against the attempt of the Most Catholic Philip, King then

of Spain and formerly also of England, to recover an English dominion. Jesuit missionaries were ceasing to gain ground, and even acquired some unpopularity with other Romanists; as Elizabeth drew near her end the Roman secular clergy supported the succession of the Protestant James. What, then, was a zealous young Papalist to do?

It was 1593, and Guy was twenty-three years old, when the English Government imposed fresh repressions, stringent and ruinous, not merely on the Romanist clergy but upon the whole body of Recusants. Thereupon Guy solved all his problems neatly by going to Flanders and enlisting in the Spanish army. For twenty-five years Spain had been fighting to maintain her grip of the Low Countries. She had lost the modern Holland, but had crushed the modern Belgium with fire and axe, with sword and Holy Inquisition. (The Holy Inquisition was an instrument of peculiarly Spanish and peculiarly monarchical policy; it was not the Church but the Kings of Spain who had made of it what it was.) In Flemish trade lay the securest source of Spanish revenue, and the country provided a colonial outpost of the utmost importance on the flank of the rival kingdom of France. Flanders held a key position, and in Flanders there was work waiting to be done.

And not work only, but work congenial to an ardent Papalist. It was Spain that had saved the Roman Church. Spanish devotion had founded the Jesuit order, with its zealous interest in education. Spanish efficiency had developed the Inquisition to repress Hebrew and Moorish citizens, had employed it to obliterate all local independence of thought, and had handed on the system to Cardinal Caraffa and Paul III. for introduction into Italy, with equally successful results; Italy and Spain were made impregnable bases from which the Counter-Reformation might sally forth across the Alps and Pyrenees. It was largely the example of Spanish austerity which had replaced with reforming zealots the Augean stable-boys of Renaissance Rome. In the Spanish service, therefore, was a vast field for loyalty. But there was more than loyalty to which it could appeal. It offered colour and passion. Here was no stagnant compromise in politics, no bleak toleration in religious faith. Instead, it promised blood, and sack, and the burning solemnities of the *auto-de-fé*.

As a soldier of Spain, Guy seems to have acquired some military reputation. His enlistment coincided in date with the decision of Henry of Navarre that Paris was well worth a Mass. That decision did not, however, immediately reconcile the Catholic League to Henry's sovereignty, and allied with the Leaguers were the Spaniards. Spanish forces invaded

France by the back door of Flanders, and Guy went with them. He was present at the capture of Calais in 1596. But two years later peace was made between France and Spain, and the cool, intrepid Englishman returned from camp to garrison.

So much for the practical education of Guy Fawkes. What opportunities he may have taken of studying the intellectual case for assassination I cannot say. But that case was already presented in the Totalitarian speculations of Machiavelli, who, nearly a century before, had transcribed the working principles of European political action into a treatise on sovereignty, with a clear-sighted realism that shocked civilization. The shock was all the greater for the fact that the transcription was objectively accurate. Europe was justly horrified to discover the intrinsic immorality of its own Renaissance. Such things are better acted on than talked about.

Machiavelli, like Calvin, believed in the total depravity of human nature. "This is to be asserted in general of men, that they are ungrateful, fickle, false, cowards, covetous" (*The Prince*, cap. xvii.). His own experience of such qualities in the Florentines had been unfortunate, but convincing. Again: "If men were entirely good," rulers would be bound to keep faith; "but because they are bad and will not keep faith with you, you too are not bound to observe it with them" (cap. xviii.).

The inference from Machiavelli's personal misfortunes was corroborated by his observation of the failure of Savonarola. Savonarola in his sermons had openly attacked the sensuality which Medicean statecraft ministered to the Florentines as an opiate for their political impotence. Hence, on the downfall of the Medici in 1494, he was chosen to play a considerable part in the reorganization of the Florentine constitution, and for a time succeeded, by the combined pressure of legislative action and homiletic exhortation, in creating a reformed Christian democracy. Florence was temporarily regenerated. But his foreign policy proved disappointing, and his appeal to the instincts of morality and religion lost first its freshness, then its power. The Pope—the Franciscans—the secular clergy—the Central Churchmen, who are always suspicious of spiritual extremism—all turned against the Dominican revivalist. Florence realized that conversion involves intolerable moral responsibilities. In 1498 Savonarola was hanged and his body burned, as a public example of the importance of being earnest. The municipality provided wine and food for the spectators.

Machiavelli had watched the preacher's career with interest and disapproval. His comments are instructive. "He was ruined, with his new order of things, immediately the multitude ceased to believe in him, and he had no means of keeping

steadfast those who believed or of making unbelievers believe" (cap. vi.). "All armed prophets"—Moses is one of the examples quoted—"have conquered; the unarmed ones have been destroyed" (*ib.*). Machiavelli concluded that his contemporaries acted habitually from self-interest, and that no motive of morality was strong enough to hold them for long without the backing of force.

His remedy was the Totalitarian State, of which the sole object and the sole standard of criticism should be the getting done of things that needed doing. It is a complete mistake to suppose that, either in the philosophy of Machiavelli or in the practice of modern Totalitarian States, the fundamental motive is anything other than social and political reconstruction. Russia, Italy, Germany, as now organized, and Spain, as it may shortly be organized, are so constituted simply in order to liquidate situations that appeared to the liquidators to be intolerable.

Machiavelli's object, plainly stated, was the unification and freedom of Italy. He admired Cesare Borgia because he thought that Cesare Borgia might have accomplished this highly desirable achievement (cap. vii.). He dedicated *The Prince* to the restored Medici in the hope that they might take up the work. The book ends with an exhortation to them "to liberate Italy from the barbarians."

Europe had once believed in a law that was above Princes, in a righteousness, embodied in a Christian social order, that was more sovereign than Sovereigns. It had lost that faith. The renaissance of a bestial paganism in Italy and elsewhere finally convinced it that the mediæval ideal was unworkable—as indeed it was, without the foundation of general acquiescence in a moral order. All that remained was to get things done somehow, as best they might. Machiavelli simply showed how this could be achieved. "One judges by the result. . . . The means will always be considered honest, and the prince will be praised by everybody because the vulgar are always taken by appearances and by results, and the world is made up of the vulgar" (cap. xviii.).

It is quite clear from a careful reading of *The Prince* that Machiavelli based practical sovereignty on the will of the governed, not on mere force. But he was convinced that the consent of the governed depends on efficient government; the people will follow a Duce gladly if the Duce gets "results." And to get those results is the Duce's only duty. Hence he approves of frightfulness, but only of so much frightfulness as will be effective and not provoke reaction (capp. viii., xvii.). He maintains that "the wise lord cannot, nor ought he to,

keep faith when such observance may be turned against himself, and when the reasons that caused him to pledge it no longer exist" (cap. xviii.). He wrote, ten years before *The Prince*, a short account of the treacherous assassination by Cesare Borgia of the Orsini and Vitelli at Sinigalia in 1502; he is quite unable to disguise his respect for the workmanlike neatness of the crime. Yet he insists that the ruler must take care, not indeed to be "merciful, faithful, humane, upright, and religious," but to present the appearance of possessing all those qualities (cap. xviii.). He regarded religion as an instrument of profound importance in reinforcing political authority. But the one thing utterly needful was the complete subordination of all other interests to the power-politics dictated by State-necessity. He never says that good ends make bad means less bad. He only notes that in order to get results you must use whatever means are practically effective.

Consciously or unconsciously, Machiavelli's principles are being exactly followed in the Totalitarian States today. They too, for one reason or another, have lost faith in the mediæval ideal, revived since Machiavelli's day in a rather different form, of an international law and a supra-national moral order. They employ various forms of frightfulness, massacring opposing elements with or without a display of judicial investigation; when they do stage a gigantic political trial, it is done not to secure justice, but frankly *pour encourager les autres*. They denounce treaties unilaterally so soon as the motives that led them to sign have ceased to operate, and boast of having planned a war of conquest, for ten years in advance, against a fellow-member of the League of Nations.* They try to appear virtuous by means of concordats with religion, or, where religion lifts up a horn of independence, do their best to smash it and substitute some other more compliant organ of popular inspiration. Like Machiavelli, they lay stress on the development of the popular will, though not of the good will. How Machiavelli would have welcomed broadcasting! The only question is whether, in the long run, the results they get are worth the price they pay.

The foregoing brief digression has been introduced merely to indicate that human nature remains much the same today as it was in the sixteenth and early seventeenth century, and that the judgment of modern Europeans must not bear hardly on Guy Fawkes for adopting principles common both to his own age and to ours. He was a soldier, a man of action, and had enjoyed ample opportunities of observing current methods

* See articles on Marshal De Bono's book in the *Daily Telegraph* of October 9 and 10, 1936.

of political performance. He was a Romanist, and was brought to believe, partly perhaps by early experience, partly by the persuasion of others, that the situation of his fellow-Romanists in England was intolerable. He thought an obstacle existed to the well-being of his friends and of true religion, and that by employing the appropriate means he could remove that obstacle. He tried for results, and failed. But it is mere hypocrisy or priggishness to impugn his sincerity. His only errors consisted in the act of private judgment that the situation was intolerable, and in assenting to the public dogma that obstacles must at all costs be removed.

The Gunpowder Plot was a retort to the penal laws against Romanists. While King James was still in Scotland he felt he needed all the support that he could muster, and encouraged Romanist hopes. When he had spent a little time in England and found himself secure in the saddle, anti-Roman legislation, the effect of which had been deliberately relaxed, was vigorously reapplied. Three jolly foxhunters—Bob Catesby, Tom Winter, and Jack Wright—then formed the famous plot; Winter went over to Flanders in 1604 and fetched Guy Fawkes to assist; other support was engaged. We know that the conspirators were religious; not only had the originators already suffered for their faith, they all, with Fawkes and Tom Percy, received Holy Communion together. A curious circumstance shows also that they regarded their project as an act of war. Catesby had some scruples of conscience, his own or others', to allay, and asked Fr. Henry Garnet, S.J., superior of the Jesuits on the English mission, whether it was morally legitimate, in the course of military operations, to fire a mine under the enemy by the explosion of which non-combatants might conceivably be injured. Fr. Garnet assured him that such a proceeding was licit.

Garnet's suspicions were, however, aroused. He was convinced that Catesby had some violent plan in prospect. But he merely told him that the Pope had forbidden violence, and that no action was to be taken until Rome had been consulted. When he afterwards heard the full details under the seal of confession, he did not feel justified in denouncing the plot to the authorities on the strength of his former suspicions, for fear, apparently, of breaking the seal of the subsequent confession. Apart, however, from his suspicions—apart also from the recognized casuistical principle of studying the general good, which might properly be held to justify the issue of a warning couched in general terms to those whose lives were threatened—it is remarkable that he was willing to concede the full cover of the seal to an intention, resolutely planned and obstinately

avowed, to commit murder. The sacrament of penance involves confession of past sin and submission to judgment. But the conspirators refused to submit to their confessor's express judgment; and the subject of their avowal was not past sin but future conduct. It might therefore be argued that, in the absence either of right intention or of valid matter, their disclosures formed no genuine confession at all; and even, perhaps, that they were addressed not to God but to the devil. There was a fatal gap somewhere or other in the Jesuit's moral theology.

It shortly proved a fatal gap to himself. He was legally suspended, not at Tyburn, but in St. Paul's churchyard, before an enormous crowd. His original sentence included the customary trimmings, but by a special exercise of clemency the more picturesque ceremonies were pretermitted and he was hanged in one piece till quite dead. So much for this most respectable and most unfortunate Wykehamist.

The conspirators, assured that the methods which they contemplated did not exceed the bounds of licit warfare, proceeded with their arrangements. They can hardly be blamed for their omission to make a formal declaration of war. Similar omissions had the force of national custom. Elizabeth's entire foreign policy had been conducted on the plan of making little wars while pretending to be at peace. And Guy Fawkes's war, like most of hers, was only a little one. The hazards, too, were about equal both in contingency and intensity. Her seamen risked the tortures of the Inquisition: Fawkes risked very similar tortures in an English prison. He endured them as gallantly as had many of the followers of Francis Drake.

So as we picture Guy Fawkes sitting in the cellar beside his hidden store of explosives, and waiting for the decisive moment which never came, it is pleasant to think that his reflections may have pursued some such course as this: "Whatever happens—and life in these expansive days is always uncertain—I sustain myself with the consideration that I am a loyal child of the Renaissance; a good soldier, a good Catholic, a good Fascist; and also, thank God, a true Elizabethan Englishman."

G. L. PRESTIGE.

MISCELLANEA

CORRESPONDENCE

CHRISTIAN PACIFISM

To the Editor of THEOLOGY

DEAR SIR,

May I reply to the Bishop of Bombay's interesting letter in your September issue ?

When I wrote that it was a sin to keep a man alive in the British prisons in India, I was thinking rather of the conditions in the prisons than of the causes of imprisonment. I suppose few Christian pacifists would go so far as to say that all reformatory detention was unchristian; but the jails of India bear no relation to reformatory detention, still less to Christianity (*cf. Condition of India*, the Report of the Delegation sent to India by the India League in 1932, ch. xiv.). They suggest a society which differs in degree but not in kind from Hitler's Germany.

Secondly, though I of course (as a pacifist) condemn the use of rifles and machine-guns, I cited the bombing of tribesmen as the most cogent indication of the distance between Christianity and the supposed needs of imperial defence. The bombing of villages victimizes non-combatants: by the time British troops enter the bombed villages, the uninjured have fled, children and old women are lying mutilated but alive, covered with flies, and the pariahs are already eating the corpses. By bombing the village reservoirs the R.A.F. destroys the tribe's means of subsistence, for the destruction of their water-supply involves the failure of their scanty crops. The tribesman's angle on the matter thus differs from the bomber's above him, and the strategical considerations which the Bishop urges would not appeal to him. It is the ancient controversy between the toad and the man with the harrow. The Bishop touches the root of the trouble, I think, when he says, "Must we really allow ourselves to be overrun whenever the tribesmen are hungry ?" The economic factor is of capital importance; and though I have not the advantage of personal knowledge of the N.W. Frontier, I have been told by an expert on imperial affairs in a position of responsibility in this country that the main reason for unrest on the frontier is a governmental policy which perpetuates the poverty and economic insecurity of the tribes. The Bishop also says, "The policy of the Government and Indian Army is to try to civilize the tribesmen." Mussolini has caught the very accents of his teachers.

Thirdly, I cannot endorse the Bishop's statement of Gandhi's motive. To say that St. Paul's aim was to "have things his own way" is to miss the point: so, I think, with Gandhi. With men of that stature their faith absorbs and transcends personal motives. Gandhi's aim has always been the pursuit of justice, whether in South Africa or in India, and whether it is the emancipation of India from British rule or the raising of the status of the Indian peasant. "In the court of conscience there is no obligation to obey an unjust law," says Aquinas; there comes a point in individual experience, said Tyrrell, when one is driven on "to follow

the dominant influence of one's life even if it should break the heart of all the world." Gandhi's "insistence on his rights" is of that quality. But his method rather than his motive concerns pacifism: he insists, not like the Christian popes and potentates of today, by doctrinal crusades, fomenting military revolutions, and preparation for war, but by vindicating truth through his own suffering.

There is, however, a deeper disagreement underlying this discussion of my references to India. From the Bishop's letter I understand that he has no misgivings about the position of the British in India; for my part, I must regard it as an iniquity. For that reason I find the causes of imprisonment in India as unchristian as the conditions of the prisons, and I deny all the presuppositions on which the necessity of defending the N.W. Frontier is based. I see nothing Christian in imprisoning men for the crime of seeking their freedom, and I do not think that the British régime in India, either for its real purpose of exploitation or for the conditions of misery and poverty which it engenders, is worth defending. But with this the Bishop's last paragraph shews me that he cannot agree. I only hope he admits that the ruthless conquest whose advantages he suggests could never be Christian; for if he does not admit this, he is throwing overboard not only the early Church and Gandhi, but Augustine and Aquinas and the Thirty-Seventh Article as well. Non-resistance to such a conquest would indeed be largely cowardice, but passive resistance to its injustices could not be sustained by anything but heroism. For it is the coward and not the pacifist who puts the false emphasis on the sanctity of human life. The coward says to himself, his life is sacred to him and he will endeavour to preserve it; the pacifist says, it is a sin for him to make the irrevocable interference with the freedom given to every man by God, but his own life, which must in any case end soon, is so worthless that the best he can do with it is to offer it in God's cause. I think it is clear that the exaggerations of the Jains are as irrelevant in refutation of that kind of pacifism as any heresy is irrelevant in refutation of any orthodoxy.

MARTIN WIGHT.

THE RED HOUSE,
TONGDEAN AVENUE,
HOVE,
SUSSEX.

WOMEN AND THE PRIESTHOOD

To the Editor of THEOLOGY

DEAR SIR,

Miss H. C. Escreet's letter in the November issue of THEOLOGY, on the above subject, contains proposals that would meet with the strongest opposition from numbers of Churchwomen who, like myself, hold that the idea of women priests is contrary to the long unbroken tradition of the Catholic Church, guided, as she is, by the Holy Spirit. It seems incredible, and fills one with consternation and amazement, that any such proposals as outlined in Miss Escreet's letter should be entertained even for one moment.

I cannot conceive of anything more likely to rend the growing unity

within the Anglican Communion, and the whole cause of re-union generally.

MARGARET E. REAY, C.B.E., J.P.,
Member of the Chelmsford Diocesan Conference.

42A, VALKYRIE ROAD,
WESTCLIFF-ON-SEA.

DEAR SIR,

In your September issue Mr. E. A. Maycock, after referring to "a regular Ministry of Women," observes that "the best Christian women seem to be the last people to desire this sacerdotal elevation for themselves."

The statement seems to be true, but in a different sense from that in which Mr. Maycock intends. May I quote from a letter published in *The Church Times* in December, 1935?

> "It is definitely to the priestly functions (along with the pastoral) that some of us believe that God is calling us, and that not, of course, for the satisfaction of our own personal desires, but in response to a need in the Church which, though it is still largely unformulated, is not for that reason necessarily to be ignored. . . . *We believe that in the priesthood we could serve Christ and His Church more fully than we can now. It is not personal 'status' that we seek: we wish to be the Church's servants* at the altar and in the confessional not less than in the Church hall or in the Sunday School.
>
> "Twenty-one years ago, when some of us first raised the question of women in the priesthood, we were told by the Church Press that 'for any sane person the thing is so absolutely grotesque that he must refuse to discuss it. . . . The monstrous regiment of women in politics would be bad enough, but the monstrous regiment of priestesses would be a thousandfold worse.' In view of such expressions it would, perhaps, be surprising if a great body of women were knocking at the barred door and asking to be allowed to enter and to serve. The number of men candidates is not immense, although in their case encouragement is usually forthcoming. . . ."

The letter was signed by six women, including two deaconesses, the wives of two priests, and a retired university lecturer. In view of the phrases which I have italicized it certainly would not seem that these women are desiring elevation "for themselves."

Yours faithfully,
W. C. ROBERTS.

ST. GEORGE'S RECTORY,
19, WOBURN SQUARE, W.C. 1.

REVIEWS

THE DOCTRINE OF THE WORD OF GOD. By Karl Barth. Translated by G. T. Thomson. T. and T. Clark. 18s.

GOD IN ACTION. Same author and publisher. Translated by E. G. Homrighausen and K. J. Ernst. 4s.

The former of these two books is a translation of the second edition of Vol. I., Part I., of the *Prolegomena to Church Dogmatics* —a translation as good as one could expect, though not a masterpiece like Sir E. Hoskyns's *Romans*. We admit the translator's modest claim that the English makes sense, while daring to wonder whether the sense always makes English. It makes Scotch sometimes, and the curious in grammar will be delighted to discover that beyond the Border one " resiles " from heretical opinions.

Such resilience ought perhaps to be ours when flung against the brick wall of Barth's Calvinism; and yet it may be more profitable to suspend judgment on whether all the limitations of that creed are really bound up with the book's main thesis, while we devote ourselves to seeing what would happen if in Barth's company we allowed ourselves to take, once for all, historical revelation with ultimate seriousness, suffering no rival authority to the *Deus dixit*.

The book deals with the nature of dogmatics, a science in which Barth believes, and we—according to his view—probably do not. For while we praise the ancient Councils for refusing to theorize, for defining mere boundaries within which living religious thought should move, we are not content with the modern theologian who tries to do the same thing. We expect rationalization, gnosis, religious philosophy; and mistaking even Barth's work for an attempt at this, accuse him of putting forward the nonsensical theory that paradoxicalness is the intrinsic nature of the Divine word.

For, having lost faith in the *Deus dixit*, we are trying to base theology not on God's revealing act, but on its own coherence and persuasiveness: like the Greeks we demand the *sophia* of theory. But Barth has no theory of the Word of God. His aim is different. God has spoken in Christ: the Church is charged to re-utter the same word. But how shall she know it is the same? She relies indeed on the Holy Spirit to guide the preacher into the right application of the scripturally-witnessed truth—yet that does not guarantee the absence of serious distortions, and therefore the Holy Spirit inspires a secondary and critical labour, that of dogmatician. He takes

the focal concepts, the vital though often latent categories of contemporary preaching, and compares them with those of Scripture.

The doctrine of the Trinity is a case in point. It is not a "theory," but just such a definition of focal conceptions. For both scripture and preaching express the acts of the Divine Agent; and one cannot speak of acts without implying certain formal characteristics in their agent. Theological science finds the characteristics so presupposed by Scripture to be that Agent's Trinity, and proceeds to test the account given of God's acts in contemporary preaching by seeing whether they are expressed in such a way that they can be attributed to an Agent thus characterized. But that does not mean that Trinity is theorized upon: it will suffice that the terms employed are intelligible.

Indeed it would appear from the controversial passages of Barth's book that the tendency to theorize (often undetected) is the chief cause of error in theology. It is his work to cut away the false attachments that grow up continually between revelation and man-made philosophies, in order to leave to it its sovereign and beneficent freedom. How difficult to break down such unhealthy adhesions without setting up others, perhaps worse, in the process, as surgeons sometimes find when they make a fresh operation to correct an old.

To be purely negative in this sense—to break down theory without introducing fresh theory—simply to let Scripture reveal its own demands—that is the chief object of Barth in revising his book for this second edition. God in His Gospel must be left to speak; the Gospel must be its own power and evidence.

Thus Barth is a dogmatist only in his own sense—in fencing an area for the free operation of the word. He is not a dogmatic theorist, but the absolute reverse. An instructive example is his treatment of the freedom in man's response to grace. He refuses all theories which attempt to co-ordinate man's will and God's, and while asserting the absolute reality of man's free act, simply appends a series of negations. It is an unique case of freedom, which does not presuppose a previous inborn capacity; real self-determination, yet not so as to exclude an absolute higher determination by God, etc.

But in untying others' theories, and insisting on his own definitions, Barth is dogmatic—*i.e.*, intolerant enough. This follows from his conception of Revelation and the function of dogmatics. It is the dogmatician's business to guide the preacher by defining the Biblical standard; and the more sharply he can define it, the better. That involves no uncharity in his

polemics: he is not excommunicating other theologians, but aiming, by debate, at perfect obedience to Scripture. Exactitude, not comprehensiveness, is the aim. Debate is with contemporaries, but also with predecessors, and the ancients have often shown the right way. Barth supplies most weighty patristic Reformation references; he is free from personal prejudice, and finds much good in Aquinas.

The doctrine of the function of dogmatics presupposes that of the Word of God, which must be expanded as its necessary basis, and so Barth passes on to exhibit it in its three forms. The preacher's word is one: that of Scripture another: and Jesus Christ Himself the third.

It is in the exposition of the relation between the second and third forms that those puzzled persons can find most satisfaction who ask "But what does Barth mean by the Word of God, anyhow?" They will find that for Barth religious language is non-representational; not a verbal picture in which we see the inexpressible mirrored, but a pointer whose sole use is to direct the mind to the memory of past or the anticipation of future experience. For we do *experience* what we cannot express. In Christ the Apostles *saw*, though through a veil, manhood restored and united to God. Through Christ they *experienced*, in themselves, such an anticipatory restoration of themselves as is possible in this world by faith, only significant, indeed, as an anticipation of a completion *hoped* hereafter. The seen, the experienced, the hoped for, was always the direct act, the ineffable *beneficium*, of God, and He was acknowledged and known as the Agent in these acts.

The conception of the Word, then, suffers analysis into two elements—language, which does not represent but indicates; and the experienced action of God upon us, which does not represent but *is*, and only indicates in so far as its incomplete, derivative and anticipatory character points beyond itself to its source and its fulfilment. Experience is really the key to all, and Barthian protests against the theology of experience do not remove it, but only define it: as when we are told that to experience God is not a human possibility, but always a free act of God; neither is it for us unmediated, but always the application to us of the God in Christ, through Scripture and faith. But this application is itself a divine act, free, new, and direct; without the actual touch of God upon us through Christ, through the Apostolic testimony, through the Spirit, we could know nothing of the meaning of the language, just because that language does not represent, but only points us to the place where God wills to act upon us. Not even when He has acted does the language take on a representational

value or form a verbal mirror of the face of God. Always it points us back to what He has done to us—primarily in Christ, derivatively in our Christian faith—or forwards to what He will do to us; finally in the Resurrection, anticipatorily in tomorrow's gift of Grace, if it comes.

Having justified his doctrine of dogmatics by his doctrine of the three forms of the Word, with whose interrelation it is concerned, Barth goes on to justify this doctrine in turn by the Biblical doctrine of God, which shews Him to be such as to reveal Himself in this threefold way. So the appeal is always from revelation to revelation, from its outward form to its deepest content. And so we have the Trinity shewn from Revelation; and the Immanent Trinity from the Economic. This orthodox and profound exposition cannot be commented upon here, though worth as much attention as any other part of the book.

There is more, much more, still to come—a second half-volume and then a volume. Yet one cannot help feeling that the cards are on the table. The rest will be working-out: none the less valuable, perhaps, for that.

The little book *God in Action* is a collection of hitherto unpublished addresses, and shows with what earnestness, simplicity and practical import the great theologian can impress the truths of the gospel as he knows it on ordinary educated people. Not least interesting, and even perhaps a little pathetic, is the last, in which we see him wrestling with the invincible humanism of a student conference. But, as he himself would say, he cannot convince any man: he can only speak the truth, and the rest lies with the Spirit of the Living God. AUSTIN FARRER.

THE CHURCH IN FRANCE, 1848-1907. By C. S. Phillips, D.D. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

This present volume of the learned Cambridge historian continues the study of the French Church of his previous book, *The Church in France*, 1749-1848. These two volumes (for the first is a necessary prelude to the second) together cover a century and a half—a tragic period for the Church in France, beginning with the Revolution and ending with the separation of Church and State. Apart from a few provinces like Brittany, French piety declined steadily after the Revolution. It has been said that France has always been sceptical: Richelieu had preferred a united France to a united Christendom; the Revolution was anti-Catholic; Napoleon, who was familiar with the cry "Vive l'Empereur; à bas la calotte," used religion for his own ends. The Empire contributed very largely to the weaken-

ing of the French Church, whose reliance on the secular arm, between 1814 and 1830, made any spiritual revival difficult. Lammenais' call for the freedom of the Church was for a time unheeded: the ultramontanists, in their battle for spiritual freedom, centred their cause on the papacy, and, in the long run, triumphed over the State. The author emphasizes clearly the distinction between the ultramontanists of the early period, fighting for liberty, and those of the later period who turned liberty into slavery, and the story of the Vatican Council is well retold in chapter vii.

The best acknowledgement of the author's merit may be expressed by stating that one does not know of so good a work in French literature. And the task is extraordinarily well done, with a breadth of outlook, a moderation of judgment and a plenitude of expressive personal portraits, based on a solid foundation of numerous monographical and biographical literature critically examined: Liberalism, relations with the papacy, the Vatican Council, the Dreyfus affair, the Law of Associations—all things of prominence are well treated.

What disparages many books of history is the variety of contents bearing little relation to a central theme: abundance of material becomes a foe to form. Dr. Phillips' book, however, has a perfection of form, a lucidity of construction, given to it by a unity of theme: the author has chosen a thread which guides him through all varieties of persons and events. This theme is the relationship between Church and State, a problem which has become so acute for the modern world since the post-war revolutions, but which has never lost its vital significance for France; and although our own problem in this connection is different, the book has, nevertheless, much to teach us on this subject. In France, since the Revolution, the Church has been living in a constant struggle against the State: its only victory, perhaps, was that the State itself was compelled to recede somewhat from the position taken up at the time of separation. The loss of vast numbers to the Church is to a large extent the result of a century of reactionary politics, connected with a defence, not of eternal values, but of a relative historical tradition. This attitude was supported, and prompted, by the Holy See, which (with the exception of Leo XIII.) could not disentangle itself from the fetters of a political short-sightedness. This is the background against which the small group of liberal Catholics stands out and whose work is so well described by the author.

The reading of this book raises the question: Why has Catholicism survived in France? How are we to explain the fact that just after the humiliation of the Catholic party in

1905 a great Catholic revival begins? Since the war we are aware, not only of the growing up of a powerful Catholic élite in all provinces of life, but also of the solving—in an unexpected way—of the ever-burning political problem in a liberal and democratic sense: the Action Française, which seemed to be synonymous with Catholicism, has been suppressed.

The marvellous vitality of the French Church demands an explanation, and the clue to it is not given by a study of political developments alone. Behind the social surface there is a depth of spiritual life of which the reader of Church History on the political plane alone can have no idea; and here the plan of the book reveals a limit, although the last pages do indeed give some correction to this statement: but two short chapters concerning modernism and the internal activity of the Church under Leo XIII. do not satisfy the thirst of the student just after that thirst has been created. This is an issue of much more general bearing. Our time, having discovered the supremacy of the spiritual, must know how to express this revelation in a new manner of writing Church History: that will be easier for the period subsequent to that described in this book. The two excellent books of Dr. Phillips need to be followed up, and for this reason, apart from others, we venture to hope that the author will not abandon his studies of French Church life: we need to know more of the modern life of French Catholicism—its social activities resulting from its inner spiritual life, its liturgical movement, its missionary activities, etc. Dr. Phillips is well equipped for this task: for the moment we are grateful to him for a very excellent study of a difficult period through which he seems to move so easily.

H. A. Moreton.

NOTICES

Causation, Freedom, and Determinism. By Mortimer Taube, Ph.D. Allen and Unwin. 10s.

This would be considered to be a remarkably good piece of work by any reader, whether or not he had noticed in an inconspicuous corner of the dust-cover a reference to the author's age, which is twenty-five. Berkeley also began to write philosophy at an incredibly early age, and his writings are still studied. Like Berkeley, Dr. Taube has the philosophic mind, a somewhat rare product, and his study of Causality, and especially the attempts made to solve its problems during the seventeenth century, is acute, original, and illuminating. His style is as lucid as his thought.

The clear distinction drawn between determinism and causation, and the proof that while determinism would exclude freedom, causation demands freedom, is a valuable contribution to the solution of a problem

which, as the author shews, has become needlessly complicated. Amongst other offenders (including Hume), those who have contended for the freedom of the will have confused the issue, notwithstanding their good intentions. Dr. Taube insists, however, that experience must be the touchstone of fact and truth, and experience gives evidence of freedom, but fails to give any evidence of determinism. The theological stronghold of the Divine Omnipotence is no defence for determinism against empirical attack, for, as Dr. Taube points out, while he has evidence of freedom in his experience, he has no experience whatever that can support the assumption of Omnipotence in God. If God's omnipotence and man's freedom are irreconcilable alternatives, then it is freedom that evinces itself as true.

The crux of the argument here advanced is the perception of causal efficacy. And at this point the author's confident affirmation, "I perceive genuine causal influence when I become conscious of the relations of emotions and feelings," may arouse more protest than the assertion that "all substances are capable of feeling." (Later in the book it appears that feeling need not be conscious feeling.) The example he gives will require much fuller analysis if it is to convince either the conservative philosopher or the radical psychologist. "In examining my experiences I discover cases of causal efficacy: for example, I may be angry at one moment and calmer at the next. I not only perceive that the moment of calm follows the moment of anger, but I perceive the moment of calm rise out of the moment of anger." Anger gives place to calm, but in what sense can the anger be said to cause the subsequent calm? Or, if the calm is caused by the preceding anger, what caused the anger? Surely the cause of the anger was some objective event and not merely a subjective experience such as a previous feeling or emotion. There is a sequence of emotions which has little or no reference to objective reality, but this is recognized as a neurotic condition. Perhaps Dr. Taube would prefer to call the event an occasional cause and not an efficient cause. If so, then my awareness of efficient causation is in my conditioning of my emotional response so that it may be appropriate in quality and degree to the objective occasion. A good deal of research might usefully be carried out on these lines. And Dr. Taube, who has rendered such valuable service in carrying this important matter so far towards a final solution, is very well qualified to attempt this further task.

CYRIL H. VALENTINE.

APOSTOLIC PREACHING AND ITS DEVELOPMENTS. By Professor C. H. Dodd. Hodder and Stoughton. 5s.

These three Lectures, to which is added an Appendix on Eschatology and History, form an interesting sequel to the previous study of The Parables of the Kingdom by the Norris-Hulse Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. Professor Dodd again pleads strongly the case for "realized" Eschatology, and here extends his investigations to the writings of St. Paul and St. John. The bare structure of the Apostolic preaching is first distilled from St. Paul's Epistles and compared with the speeches in Acts. From this it is seen that there are three main elements in the structure: the fulfilment of prophecy in the life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus the Messiah; the inauguration of the Age to Come in which Jesus is Lord; the consummation of the whole process at the

Second Coming of the Messiah; in fact, past history, present experience, and future hope. The first development of the primitive preaching is made by St. Paul; he sees that in the gift of the Spirit to the Church the Age to Come is being realized here and now. In the Synoptic Gospels the historical element in the preaching is developed, but always within its eschatological setting. But Paul's development started from an eschatological valuation of present experience, the Synoptic Gospels from a similar valuation of past history. St. John's Gospel is a restatement of the preaching which brings together the three elements—past, present, and future. "All that the Church hoped for in the Second Advent is already given in its present experience of Christ through the Spirit; and, on the other hand, this present experience penetrates the record of the events that brought it into being, and reveals its deep significance."

Thus the New Testament is a unity to be interpreted in terms of realized eschatology. Moreover, the eschatology is verified in the Apostolic Church; the Church in proclaiming its Gospel to the world offered its own fellowship and experience as the realization of the Gospel.

So the preacher today who will be faithful to the New Testament must be faithful to its eschatology, in a world out of touch with such a way of thought, to which indeed it is foolishness. We can only be thankful that the problem has been so clearly stated in this book.

J. A. RAMSBOTHAM.

IS CHRISTIANITY UNIQUE? By Dr. Nicol Macnicol. S.C.M. 6s.

Dr. Macnicol has done a great service to all who wish to think intelligently about the relation of Christianity to other religious faiths. Speaking from a profound knowledge of the Religions of the East, and with a wide experience of missionary work in India, he is peculiarly fitted to test the growing tendency to place Christianity alongside of these religions, rather than over against them.

The World Congress of Faiths has recently brought this issue more into the open, but it is one which the Christian missionary has always to face. Moreover, one of the most interesting of the lectures in this book shews how far Western thought is now being influenced by Oriental religious ideas, wherever faith in the supernatural sanctions of Christianity has been laid aside. The Christian must always believe that "He who comes from above is far above all others; he who springs from earth belongs to earth and speaks of earth." But to be far above all others does not necessarily mean that all others are nowhere. In order to judge wherein Christianity is unique, and not merely far above all religions, it is necessary not only to compare their theologies and their systems of ethics, but also to answer the question, "In what sense is Jesus Lord?"

The strength of this book lies in the comparison between the quality of life which Christianity produces and that which the other great religions produce. The weakness lies in the failure to bring out the New Testament answer to the question, "In what sense is Jesus Lord?" Consequently these lectures are very helpful in shewing wherein Christianity is superior to all other religions, but not so helpful in shewing wherein its uniqueness lies.

J. A. RAMSBOTHAM.

THE SUGAR COLONIES AND GOVERNOR EYRE, 1849-1866. By W. L. Matheson. Longmans, Green. 12s. 6d.

Whatever the World War may or may not have done, it has certainly altered our attitude to and our interpretation of the past. The events of the French Revolution of 1789 take on a new aspect in a generation like our own, which has witnessed so many revolutions from 1917 onwards, and the end of revolutions is not yet in sight. A revolution generally means sooner or later a dictator or a succession of dictators. We who live in a revolutionary era cannot quite take the same line towards Governor Eyre as the men of the sixties. They lived in a day when, in England at least, liberty of the expression of opinion and toleration were becoming increasingly greater forces. None then, with the exception of a Carlyle, could foresee a generation when dictatorship might become the order of the day. Mr. Matheson skilfully portrays the action of the strong man, Governor Eyre, in putting down the insurrection of negroes, and putting it down with all the force at his disposal. There is an extremely good character sketch of Governor Eyre, and the author knows him from the inside, not from the outside. There is an equally good character sketch of C. W. Gordon, the negro agitator, and we grasp through him the grievances from which the negro suffered. It was inevitable in the mid-Victorian period that men of the J. S. Mill type should depreciate Eyre, just as it was inevitable that men of the Carlyle type should appreciate him. What emerges from this book, at least to one reader, is the comparative standard of the judgments we employ, and how much men like Governor Eyre is at the mercy of them. The asperities of the sixties have long since worn away, and we live in an age which, while forgetful of them, can once more better understand the times in which Eyre flourished, and can better grasp the complexities of the task that he encountered in the revolt and massacre of 1865 and the consequent reorganization of Jamaica as a Crown colony. Mr. Matheson has discharged his difficult task supremely well, and has held the scales of justice as if we are not living in a revolutionary era. But we are, and the Zeitgeist affects our judgment of the worth of this work.

R. H. MURRAY.

JOHN STUART MACKENZIE. By his wife. Williams and Norgate. 5s.

This is a modestly told account of the life and work of a philosopher who left a deep impression on his pupils, an impression that many counted as the most formative impulse in their lives. The man himself began his autobiography as a philosopher's quest, and here is how he describes himself: "It is my object in this book to try and give an intelligible view of the general nature and purpose of human life and of the universe in which it is carried on. Much has been written about this, both in definitely philosophical expositions and by essayists, poets, and religious teachers; but each generation is apt to feel that much of what has been written has either ceased to carry conviction or at least needs to be restated, in view of the advance of knowledge or of the discovery of different modes of statement which appeared to have become necessary. I think that it would be best that I should begin by giving some account of the particular influences by which the development of my own thought has been conditioned. This involves the writing of

an autobiography, but I intend it to be, as far as possible, a biographica philosophica." Between intention and execution the hand of death intervened, and the result is that we have in part what J. S. Mackenzie intended to carry out. His wife has gallantly stepped into the breach, and has given us a full and frank account of the many-sided life her husband led. There are a foreword by Professor J. H. Muirhead and an estimate of the life and work by Dr. W. Tudor Jones. Fragmentary as the whole book necessarily is, it is a precious fragment which no one who cares to grasp the moral philosophy of recent years can afford to ignore. Large-hearted Platonist that he was, it is clear how Glasgow and Cambridge acted and reacted upon him. He was a critic whose approval was felt by graduate or undergraduate to put the final seal on any work of theirs. Not a little of the attention now paid on all sides to moral philosophy is due to one who always practised and inculcated that high standard of accuracy and that deep devotion to truth which meant everything to Mackenzie.

R. H. MURRAY.

THE APOCALYPSE EXPLAINED FOR READERS OF TODAY. By W. J. Ferrar. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

The contents of this book consist of the apocalyptic background, the historical conditions, the contents, the date, the authorship, and modern theories of the composition, and the permanent value of the Apocalypse. Of the scholarship of the book there cannot be the least question, and the author is not too much overawed by the great commentary Archdeacon Charles wrote on the Revelation of St. John the Divine. While all the book reaches a high level of thought, it is possible to single out parts that are specially good, and among these we should certainly place the accounts of the apocalyptic background, the historical conditions, and the permanent value of the book itself. Not the least of Mr. Ferrar's merits is his power of illustration. Take some of the opening sentences in proof of this: "In his life of Bishop Gore, Dr. Prestige compares him with his friend Scott Holland. Both men were equally sensitive to moral issues, both were prophetic in their outlook and action; but 'Holland's mind,' he says, 'though no less religious, was less apocalyptic. To Gore the world was so bad that its redemption seemed only possible by the immediate judgment of God.' Now, this pessimism about the world-order that we know is the keynote of the strictly apocalyptic writers; they see all earthly events moving swiftly to God's catastrophic climax, and regard this breaking-in of the eternal into the temporal order as a rapid sequence of historical events." Here is an admirable illustration of the spirit in which the last book in our Bible ought to be read.

R. H. MURRAY.

A SHORT DEVOTIONAL INTRODUCTION TO THE HEBREW BIBLE FOR THE USE OF JEWS AND JEWESSES. By C. G. Montefiore. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.

In this short and beautiful book we have the intimate teaching of the veteran Liberal Jewish scholar who has so long been a kind of intellectual bridge between us and modern Judaism. It would be an impertinence to criticize it, for it is a purely domestic essay addressed

to his fellow Jews and Jewesses, who it would seem are tending to neglect and undervalue their peculiar heritage enshrined in the Old Testament; it is no apologia for Judaism as against Christianity; indeed, the writer is very reticent in referring to our religion, except that he stresses in a broad charity the real value of all true religion other than his own.

Yet, domestic as it is, it should be read with sympathy by Christian students, not only because it throws light on the actual standpoint and outlook of cultured Judaism, but because its summary of the value of the Old Testament is so clear and convincing. Indeed, with added Jewish insight into a treasury of Rabbinical interpretation its positions are those of Peake, Driver, Skinner, G. Adam Smith, and Lofthouse, whose commentaries he recommends to the Jewish student.

Dr. Montefiore finds the cream of Old Testament teaching in the pre-exilic prophets, Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, Micah, and Jeremiah, whom he calls "the big five," who were "the creators for us, and for all the millions, who ultimately derive their religion from us of what is commonly called ethical Monotheism." Their teaching is completed and universalized by the unknown prophet of Isaiah xl. to lv. This latter section is the core of Judaism, "bone of its bone and spirit of its spirit," the inspiration of the race called to witness by continuous suffering to the truth of God. It is the race that is the servant; his embodiment in an historical person was but a dream.

Dr. Montefiore shews that Law and Sacrifice had their disciplinary and communal uses in the evolution of the racial religion, and touches with understanding the problems of Job, Ecclesiastes, the Psalms, and the Wisdom writers; he does not deal with the historical books, occupied as he is with thought rather than action.

The Rabbinical illustrations of Hebrew thought are exceedingly interesting, and would be more valuable to the inquirer into the relations of the teaching of Christ to contemporary Rabbinical pronouncements if they were even approximately dated. How far, we should like to ask, is the similarity due to the impact of Christianity upon Judaism? The pages dealing with such doctrines as *Lishmah* (the study of the Law "for its own sake"), *Kawwanah* (the need of "intention" or "concentration" in prayer), and the conception of the divine Fatherhood as evolved by the Rabbis, will be perhaps new and instructive to Christian students.

It is interesting finally to know exactly where Reformed Judaism is in regard to a future life. The scanty attention to its problems in the Old Testament is dealt with much on the usual lines, but the later apocalyptists are not referred to. The doctrine of a bodily resurrection is rejected. Dr. Montefiore professes that it is "the doctrine of the immortality of the soul," which is "largely due to Platonic and Pythagorean influences," that he holds. "This is the doctrine to which we give our adherence today. We mean by it that, without any revivification of the physical body, we cling to the hope that, in some manner or form which we cannot picture or imagine, our spiritual personality or identity will continue to live after our earthly death." W. J. FERRAR.

THE GOSPELS AND THE CRITIC. By A. W. F. Blunt, D.D. Bishop of Bradford. Oxford University Press. 2s. 6d.

Dr. Blunt's paper on Christ in the Gospels was the chief scholarly contribution to a Congress chiefly occupied with practical matters. The

Bishop now sends it out in an enlarged form at a very modest cost for the benefit of those who, without being specialist students of the Bible, wish to know the present position in Gospel criticism.

Opening with a spirited defence of scientific study in which he shews the consensus arrived at by Old Testament students, and considers most sanely how far it is affected by archæological research, he goes on to shew how similar critical work has produced in the main similar agreement on the Synoptic problem and that of the Fourth Gospel, which he regards as "secondarily and in details based on authoritative information from an eye-witness." Then he recounts the rise and fall of the Liberal Protestant School, the *volte-face* of Harnack, and the historical work of Ramsay and Edwyn Bevan; next comes (1910) Schweitzer, "the single-minded player of one rich string," who claims to have "the one key which opens all locks"; the appreciation of his work and devotion to his lofty sense of duty to "the One unknown, without a name," revealed in the ineffable mystery of His fellowship, is frank and full, but the critique is none the less devastating: "The older school read Jesus as one with a programme of moral idealism. The new school reads Him as the herald of a divine event. But does He not seem to have been both of these, and more?" A valuable chapter follows on the new adventure in criticism (*Formgeschichte*), of which the Bishop sees the advantage, if its classifications are kept free from subjective impressions and mere speculation. The Gospels contain personal reminiscence, and fulfil the need of the primitive community of the Church as well; there is nothing to quarrel with in this, and after all Form-History moves back the Gospel "tradition about Jesus into the twenty years immediately following Pentecost."

The last chapter recurs to the defence of scholarship and scientific method, and considers the difficult problem of the teacher and preacher until a consensus is finally reached. Anyway, the Bishop says "we must follow the truth, wheresoever it leads us, at all costs," and reminds us that the great Catholic tradition of Christ is the safeguard against fads, heresies, and disproportions.

It is evident that we have in this short book a most valuable piece of work. There are few who could have compressed the story of recent criticism so adequately, and criticized its products with such sanity and clearness. It ought to be on every priest's bookshelf, in every church library, and mentioned constantly to laymen, who "want to know, you know."

W. J. FERRAR.

HAGGERSTON SERMONS. By H. A. Wilson. With drawings by Clare Dawson. Mowbrays. 3s. 6d.

Friends of Father Wilson will like to have these sermons, and to know what he actually talks about to the people he understands and loves so well. They are charmingly illustrated. With his knack of translating the religion of the Church into the patter of the man in the street, his humour a trifle broad for any other pulpit, and his intense sympathy with suffering, he makes the old unchanging East rise before the mind's eye, which once knew it well. (Mrs. Pomegranate is true to life—and John Brown in "the London": Albert, 'Orris, Mrs. Snatchpiece, and the rest.) These "impromptus" are, the Father says, the result of a week's work begun on Monday; he does not claim to be clever enough to give

St. Augustine's good stuff like this without preparation. Let the young preacher take that to heart, but let him not venture to imitate Father Wilson in his style and manner of speech or illustration—for it would be disastrous. Such freedom must be born of experience.

W. J. FERRAR.

BOOK NOTES

Mid-Week Talks. By W. H. Elliott. Mowbrays. 2s. Do we sufficiently appreciate the boon to religion of being "on the air"? That Christian propaganda, and not anti-Christian, is allowed? Mr. Elliott's Thursday Evening Talks are too familiar to need comment other than a note of gratitude.

At One: Tower Hill and its Questions. By Harold Rew. Mowbrays. 1s. All honour to the brave spirits who face the music in Hyde Park, Tower Hill, and elsewhere. We are glad to have this record of a mission, now interrupted by a breakdown from overwork, which has succeeded notably.

Concerning Progressive Revelation. By Vivian Phelips. Watts and Co. 1s. A chapter, extended and brought up to date, from "Philip Vivian's" *The Churches and Modern Thought.*

The Mysteries of Life and Death. Hutchinson. 6s. The writers are the Bishop of Birmingham, Bertrand Russell, Dr. Spencer Jones, Professor J. B. S. Haldane, and others; the subjects are Death, the After-Life, the Atom, Are there Other Inhabited Worlds? etc. The value of the book consists in the fame of the authors. The space allotted to each, the length of a newspaper article, is insufficient to make their contributions of serious value to students.

Christianity in Thought and Practice. By William Temple. S.C.M. 2s. 6d. The Archbishop of York is so prolific a writer that probably his greatest admirers do not keep pace with his output. These Moody Lectures, delivered at Chicago, will be specially useful to those who shrink from mastering his larger books and want to know what his philosophy means when applied to international problems. They deal in short compass with the claims of the State against the individual, the beginnings of a new philosophy which shall be a synthesis of mediæval and modern thought, and the possibility of a nation's acting in a Christian way.

Memories of Brooke Foss Westcott. By A. G. B. West. Heffers. 2s. A tiny book, but full to the brim of fragrant charm; it recalls the personality of a great prophet and Christian to a generation which has almost forgotten him.

Holy Bible. Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d. and upwards. The Bible publishers never rest in their efforts to plan new and cheap Bibles with skilfully devised type. The King's Printers have just issued a new edition. The Oxford University Press have produced a miracle of comely type in small compass, which is yet too small for ageing eyes. But the latest attempt of the Cambridge University Press is perhaps the most noteworthy. The type is large and very clear, italics are eschewed, and the verse numbers are not indented, though each verse in the traditional manner begins a new line.

W. K. L. C.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXIII

JULY—DECEMBER, 1936

PAGE

Anniversary of the Danish Reformation, 1536-1936, The 349
BEEVOR, HUMPHRY 138
BIRLEY, H. H. 105
Bishop Butler and the Primacy 132
BOMBAY, Bishop of 175
Books Reviewed:

Christian Worship. Edited by Nathaniel Micklem 245
Church in France, 1848-1907, The. By C. S. Phillips, D.D. 373
Connop Thirwall, Historian and Theologian. By John Connop Thirwall, Jun. 181
Doctrine of the Word of God, The, *and* God in Action. By K. Barth . . 370
Edward Stuart Talbot, 1844-1934. By Gwendolen Stephenson . . . 118
English Bishops and the Reformation, The, 1530-1560. By C. S. Mortimer and S. C. Barber 179
Essence of Judaism, The. By Leo Baeck 109
From Christ to Constantine. By James Mackinnon 52
Grace of God in Faith and Philosophy, The. By L. Hodgson . . . 115
Jesus, Paul and the Jews. By James Parkes 109
Life and Times of St. Ambrose, The. By F. Homes Dudden . . . 303
Medieval Representation and Consent. By M. V. Clarke 301
Parables in the Light of their Jewish Background, The. By W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D. 244
Reformation, the Mass and the Priesthood, The. By E. C. Messenger, D.D. . 111
Works of St. John of the Cross, The. Translated by E. Allison Peers . . 241

Bossuet as a Preacher 198
Canaanitish Woman, The 107
Certain Greeks 35, 87
Christian Pacifism 12, 175, 176, 367
CLARKE, O. R. 47
Correspondence 48, 175, 239, 295, 367
COWLEY, PATRICK 210
CROSS, F. L. 111
Data of Theology, The 218
Dean of Carlisle, The 49
DE CANDOLE, HENRY 245
Dr. Messenger and Anglican Orders 138, 295
EGERTON SWANN, N. E. 219
ESCREET, H. C. 298
FARRER, AUSTIN 370
F. C. S. 239
FERRAR, W. J. 109
FIRMINGER, W. K. 179
Footnote to Intercommunion, A 45
From a Free Churchman 47
Germanic Faith Movements 336
Guy Fawkes 357
HAWORTH, H. W. 47
HEALEY, KENNETH 173
Historical Element in Christianity, The 165
Historical Values of "The Discourses" in St. John, The 70
JARRETT-KERR, W. R. 176
JENKINS, CLAUDE 301
KIDD, B. J. 118
KNOX, WILFRED L. 244
LANG, L. W. 81
LEE, E. KENNETH 7
LESTER-GARLAND, L. V. 228
LEVERTOFF, PAUL P. 283
Logic of Birth Control, The 48, 173
MAJOR, H. D. A. 177
"Manuductio ad Cœlum"—A Forgotten Classic 210
MAYCOCK, E. A. 146
MESSENGER, E. C. 239, 293

	PAGE
MICKELWRIGHT, F. H. AMPHLETT	45
Modern Humanism and its Denial of the Supernatural	261
MORETON, H. A.	373
MORTIMER, R.	52
MOULDER, E. M.	336
MURRAY, J. O. F.	70
NORTHCOTT, HUBERT	241
Notes on Periodicals	51, 107, 178, 299, 300
Our Lord's Temptation	104, 239
Outer Darkness, The	277
Parish Priest and the Life of Prayer, The	326
PARRY, EDWARD	174
"Pelagianism"	177
PRENTER, REGIN	349
PRESTIGE, G. L.	357
PRIDIE, J. R.	107
Processional Confirmation Hymn	174
Psychological Significance of the Virgin Birth	81
Quietism and Pietism	21
REAY, MARGARET	369
Reformation, the Mass, and the Priesthood, The	239, 293
Relevance of the Church, The	146
Revelation xv. 2, Note on	47
ROBERTS, R. ELLIS	261
ROBERTS, W. C.	369
ROBINSON, F. DOUGLAS	155
Sacraments of the Church and Nature, The	7
ST. JOHN, HENRY	295
SAMPSON, ASHLEY	48
School of English Church Music, The	47
Sequence of Thought in the Pauline Epistles, The	228
SHORT, A. E.	165
SIMPSON, W. J. SPARROW	303
SLATER, R. H. L.	35, 87
Some Critical Assumptions	50
Spanish Church under the Moors, The	283
SYKES, N.	132
SYNGE, E. F.	104
TAYLOR, R. O. P.	277
TILLEY, A. A.	198
Two Prayers	49
UNDERHILL, EVELYN	326
VALENTINE, CYRIL H.	115
VAUGHAN, HERBERT M.	181
WIGHT, MARTIN	12, 367
Women and the Priesthood	298
World Evangelisation	155
WRIGHT, W. REES	50
YOUNG, IVAN R.	21
Zoë in St. John	105

Printed in Great Britain by Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher